

# THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE BULLETIN

VOL. XIII, NO. 332

NOVEMBER 4, 1945

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.

## *In this issue*

### NEIGHBORING NATIONS IN ONE WORLD

*Address by the Secretary of State*

### THE VOICE OF AMERICA

*Address by Assistant Secretary Benton*

### THE ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY AND WORLD TRADE

*By Edward G. Miller, Jr.*

### POSTSCRIPTS ON THE THIRD INTER-AMERICAN RADIOCOMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE

*By Robert R. Burton and Donald R. MacQuivey*

*For complete contents  
see inside cover*



THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BULLETIN

VOL. XIII • No. 332 •



• PUBLICATION 2419

November 4, 1945

*The Department of State BULLETIN, a weekly publication compiled and edited in the Division of Research and Publication, Office of Public Affairs, provides the public and interested agencies of the Government with information on developments in the field of foreign relations and on the work of the Department of State and the Foreign Service. The BULLETIN includes press releases on foreign policy issued by the White House and the Department, and statements and addresses made by the President and by the Secretary of State and other officers of the Department, as well as special articles on various phases of international affairs and the functions of the Department. Information concerning treaties and international agreements to which the United States is or may become a party and treaties of general international interest is included.*

*Publications of the Department, cumulative lists of which are published at the end of each quarter, as well as legislative material in the field of international relations, are listed currently.*

*The BULLETIN, published with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, United States Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., to whom all purchase orders, with accompanying remittance, should be sent. The subscription price is \$3.50 a year; a single copy is 10 cents.*

# Contents

## AMERICAN REPUBLICS

Recognition of Government of Venezuela . . . . .	734
Normal Relations With New Brazilian Administration . .	734
Postscripts on the Third Inter-American Radiocommunications Conference. By Robert R. Burton and Donald R. MacQuivey . . . . .	735

## THE CARIBBEAN

Meeting of Anglo-American Caribbean Forestry Committee . . . . .	737
--	-----

## EUROPE

Participation by Civil Authorities in Government of Germany . . . . .	711
Visit of Prime Minister Attlee . . . . .	714
Mail Service to Italy . . . . .	734
Hungarian Minister to the United States . . . . .	734

## FAR EAST

Far Eastern Advisory Commission:	
Advisers to United States Representative . . . . .	728
Appointment of Temporary Secretary . . . . .	728
Appointment of Indian Representative . . . . .	728
List of Representatives . . . . .	728
Opening Session:	
Statement by the Secretary of State . . . . .	728
Motion Presented by Chinese Representative . . . . .	729
Japanese Reparations Mission:	
Announcement by the President . . . . .	729
Members of the Mission . . . . .	729
Directive From General MacArthur to the Imperial Japanese Government . . . . .	730
Departure From Shanghai of the S. S. <i>Lavaca</i> . . . . .	733

## NEAR EAST

U. S. Supply Arrangements for the Middle East . . . . .	737
---	-----

## CULTURAL COOPERATION

Dickson Reck Returns From China . . . . .	733
---	-----

## GENERAL

The Voice of America. Address by Assistant Secretary Benton . . . . .	712
Pearl Harbor Investigation . . . . .	733
Areas Opened for Civilian Travel . . . . .	733

## THE UNITED NATIONS

Neighboring Nations in One World. Address by the Secretary of State . . . . .	709
Meeting of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations:	
Agreement on the Security Council . . . . .	720
Discussion on the Secretariat . . . . .	721
Discussions on the Report on the General Assembly . .	721
Discussions on Location of United Nations Permanent Headquarters . . . . .	722
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations:	
Food and Agriculture Subcommittee of the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe . . . . .	734
Position of Soviet Delegation Regarding FAO. Report by the Chairman . . . . .	739
Final Plenary Session . . . . .	739

(Continued on Page 742)

# Neighboring Nations in *ONE WORLD*

*Address by*  
**THE SECRETARY OF STATE<sup>1</sup>**

**T**HE SUBJECT about which I wish to speak briefly this evening is "Neighboring Nations in One World."

It was no accident that President Roosevelt, who did so much to develop our inter-American system, did even more to develop the world community of the United Nations. For today all nations are neighbors, and although we may have special relations with our nearer neighbors in the Americas, we must remember that we and they are parts of a single, interdependent world.

When we consider the principles which govern our inter-American system as it has been worked out in recent years, it is well to remember that these principles were not always recognized by us in our relations with our neighbors. There were times, not so far distant, when we tried "dollar diplomacy" and intervention and were accused of "Yankee imperialism."

But we have learned by experience that to have good neighbors we must be a good neighbor.

We have discovered that understanding and good-will cannot be bought and cannot be forced. They must spring spontaneously from the people. We have learned also that there can be no lasting friendship between governments unless there is understanding and good-will between their peoples.

In the inter-American system the members do not interfere in the internal affairs of their neighbors nor do they brook interference in those internal affairs by others. Freedom means more than freedom to act as we would like them to act.

But we do want other people to know what our people are thinking and doing. And we want to know what other people are thinking and doing. Only with such knowledge can each people determine for itself its way of life.

We believe other nations have a right to know of our own deep attachment to the principles of

democracy and human rights; our profound belief that governments must rest upon the free consent of the governed; and our firm conviction that peace and understanding among nations can best be furthered by the free exchange of ideas.

While we adhere to the policy of non-intervention, we assert that knowledge of what other people are thinking and doing brings understanding; and understanding brings tolerance and a willingness to cooperate in the adjustment of differences.

Censorship and blackouts, on the other hand, breed suspicion and distrust. And all too often this suspicion and distrust are justified. For censorship and blackouts are the handmaidens of oppression.

The policy of non-intervention in internal affairs does not mean the approval of local tyranny. Our policy is intended to protect the right of our neighbors to develop their own freedom in their own way. It is not intended to give them free rein to plot against the freedom of others.

We have learned by bitter experience in the past ten years that Nazi and Fascist plans for external aggression started with tyrannies at home which were falsely defended as matters of purely local concern. We have learned that tyranny anywhere must be watched, for it may come to threaten the security of neighboring nations and soon become the concern of all nations.

If, therefore, there are developments in any country within the inter-American system which, realistically viewed, threaten our security, we con-

<sup>1</sup> Delivered before the *Herald Tribune* Forum in New York, N. Y., on Oct. 31, 1945 and released to the press Nov. 1.



sult with other members in an effort to agree upon common policies for our mutual protection.

We Americans can take genuine pride in the evolution of the good-neighbor policy from what, in a way, were its beginnings in the Monroe Doctrine. We surely cannot and will not deny to other nations the right to develop such a policy.

Far from opposing, we have sympathized with, for example, the effort of the Soviet Union to draw into closer and more friendly association with her central and eastern European neighbors. We are fully aware of her special security interests in those countries, and we have recognized those interests in the arrangements made for the occupation and control of the former enemy states.

We can appreciate the determination of the people of the Soviet Union that never again will they tolerate the pursuit of policies in those countries deliberately directed against the Soviet Union's security and way of life. And America will never join any groups in those countries in hostile intrigue against the Soviet Union. We are also confident that the Soviet Union would not join in hostile intrigue against us in this hemisphere.

We are concerned to promote friendship, not strife, among neighbors everywhere. For twice in our generation strife among neighbors has led to world conflict. Lasting peace among neighbors has its roots in spontaneous and genuine friendship. And that kind of friendship among nations depends upon mutual respect for one another.

It is our belief that all peoples should be free to choose their own form of government, a government based upon the consent of the governed and adapted to their way of life.

We have put that belief into practice in our relations with our neighbors. The Soviet Union has also declared that it does not wish to force the Soviet system on its neighbors. The whole-hearted acceptance of this principle by all the United Nations will greatly strengthen the bonds of friendship among nations everywhere.

But the point I wish to emphasize is that the policy of the good neighbor, unlike the institution of marriage, is not an exclusive arrangement. The best neighbors do not deny their neighbors the right to be friends with others.

We have learned that our security interests in this hemisphere do not require its isolation from economic and cultural relations with the rest of the world.

We have freely accepted the Charter of the

United Nations, and we recognize the paramount authority of the world community. The Charter, while reserving to us and other nations the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense in case of armed attack, requires that enforcement action taken under regional arrangements be sanctioned by the Security Council of the United Nations Organization.

Moreover, we adhere strictly to the policy that cooperation among the American republics does not justify discrimination against non-American states. The American republics have practiced the policy of equal treatment for all states which respect the sovereignty and integrity of their fellow states.

Inter-American cooperation is not inconsistent with world-wide cooperation among the nations. Regional arrangements, like the inter-American system, which respect the rights and interests of other states and fit into the world system can become strong pillars in the structure of world peace.

But we cannot recognize regional arrangements as a substitute for a world system. To do so would not promote the common and paramount interests of all nations, large and small, in world peace.

We live in one world; and in this atomic age regional isolationism is even more dangerous than is national isolationism.

We cannot have the kind of cooperation necessary for peace in a world divided into spheres of exclusive influence and special privilege.

This was the great significance of the Moscow Declaration of 1943.<sup>1</sup> That joint statement of policy pledged the world's most powerful nations to mutual cooperation in winning the war and maintaining the peace. It was a landmark in our efforts to create a world community of nations and to abandon the discredited system of international relations based upon exclusive spheres of influence.

Out of the Moscow Declaration have come the Dumbarton Oaks, Tehran, Crimea, San Francisco, and Potsdam conferences. And the United Nations Organization and the London Council of Foreign Ministers were created in the spirit of that Declaration.

International cooperation must—as I emphasized in my recent report on the London Council—depend upon intelligent compromise. It does not require us or any other nation to neglect its special relations with its nearer neighbors. But it

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Nov. 6, 1943, p. 308.



does require that all neighborly relations be fitted into an organized system of international relations world-wide in scope.

The world system which we seek to create must be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of nations.

That does not mean that all nations are equal in power and in influence any more than all men are equal in power and influence. But it does mean equal respect for the individuality and sovereignty of nations, large and small. Nations, like individuals, should be equal before the law.

That principle is the cornerstone of our inter-American system as it is the cornerstone of the United Nations.

Adherence to that principle in the making of the peace is necessary if we are to achieve endur-

ing peace. For enduring peace is indivisible. It is not the exclusive concern of a few large states or a few large groups of states. It is the concern of all peoples.

Believing this, the position of the United States will continue to be that the nations, large and small, which have borne the burdens of the war must participate in making the peace.

In centuries past powerful nations have for various purposes tried to divide the world among themselves. They failed, and in failing left a trail of blood through the centuries. Such efforts have even less chance of success in the modern world where all nations have become neighbors.

Today the world must make its choice. There must be one world for all of us or there will be no world for any of us.

## Participation by Civil Authorities in Government of Germany

[Released to the press by the White House October 31]

26 OCTOBER 1945.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT:

You will recall that, when you were in Frankfurt, you and I agreed upon the desirability of so organizing the Army's current functions in Europe as to facilitate turning U.S. participation in the government of Germany over to civil authority at the earliest possible moment. It is my understanding that the War Department completely supports this view. Every organizational step we have taken has been accomplished in such a way as to facilitate eventual transfer. Nevertheless I am quite sure that there is a very widespread lack of realization as to the governing intent along this line, basing this statement upon the frequency with which visitors express astonishment that this purpose exists as a guiding policy.

Naturally I am not in position to recommend an exact date on which such transfer should take place, since I have assumed that the four interested governments would first have to agree in principle and thereafter to make arrangements for simultaneous change from military to civil representatives. Moreover, there may be considerations, important to our government, of which I am unaware. However, from our local viewpoint, other governments could well be asked to agree to the proposal at the earliest date that can be mutually agreed upon, in no event later than June 1, 1946.

As quickly as the matter could be agreed in principle, but not before, then actual completion of the American civil organization should be undertaken by whatever civilian you might, at that time, designate as its eventual head. Such things as these require time but I am confident that we should not allow this detail to obscure, in the mind of any interested person, the clarity of the objective toward which we are striving.

The matter of civil government of Germany is entirely separate from the occupational duty of the Army, which responsibility will persist as long as our own Government deems necessary. The true function of the Army in this region is to provide for the United States that reserve of force and power than can insure within our zone the prompt enforcement of all laws and regulations prescribed by the Group Council, or in the absence of such law and regulation, the policies laid down by our own Government for the United States zone.

As you pointed out when here, separation of occupational and governmental responsibility is sound just as soon as there is no longer any military or security reason for holding them together, if for no other reason than because of its conformity to the American principle of keeping the Army as such out of the civil government field.

Respectfully,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

# The Voice of America

Address by

ASSISTANT SECRETARY BENTON

[Released to the press October 30]

The voice of America is a voice with ten thousand tongues. It is all that the people of other lands hear about us and all that they read about us. It is the American movies they see and the American G.I.'s and tourists they meet.

I am glad we Americans speak with ten thousand voices. Some critics would call it a confusion of voices. But it is the democratic way of peoples speaking to peoples. The alternative way—the single voice—is the way of censorship and of ministries of propaganda.

My theme tonight is that the people of the United States, through their Government and their State Department, have a vital national interest in the voice of America. Their national security may be at stake if this voice is inadequate or distorted—if it fails to represent us with reasonable fullness and fairness as we really are, our history and our culture, our faults and our fears, our hopes and our ambitions for our democratic processes and our free society.

Today 38 short-wave radio transmitters, operating all over the world under the direction of our Government, are known to millions in Asia, Africa, and Europe by the name, the *Voice of America*. Here is an example of the new role of government. The Voice of America radio programs supplement and help to clarify the message of America's ten thousand tongues. Further, they reach vast areas of the world which otherwise would be completely shut off from America.

There are people in Iceland, in China, Iran, the Argentine, and the Balkans—millions of ordinary people all over the world who listen eagerly for America's voice. During the war these Voice of America broadcasts went out over the air every day in the year in 40 languages. Today, in the backwash of the war, they go out in 18 languages. They give people in foreign lands straight, impartial news from America, news in their own languages, news untainted by special pleading or by propaganda.

<sup>1</sup> Delivered before the *Herald Tribune* Forum in New York, N. Y., on Oct. 30, 1945.

The radio Voice of America was developed in war by the Government. Now before the American people and the Congress is the broad and inclusive question: "What role shall the Government play in America's voice abroad in peacetime?"

Is it enough, in the rapidly contracting world of today, for our people and our Government to be presented to the peoples of the world as a giant, completely equipped with battleships, superfortresses, and atomic bombs, but voiceless except for diplomatic exchanges and the erratic interplay of private communication?

There is one basis for judging the future information policy of the Government abroad upon which we can all agree.

Does an expanded peacetime role for government help us to achieve national security? Is it worthwhile deliberately to explain ourselves to the rest of the world? Does this help give us willing and friendly allies, in times of crisis as well as in peace? Is understanding also a force? Isn't it the kind of force that we prefer? Suppose we had to choose between two investments in security—between a year's cost of the radio Voice of America and its rough equivalent, a year's cost of operating one battleship in a fleet of battleships?

These are new questions for America. They will be debated in the next few weeks and over the years to come. Battleships are the traditional symbols of our security. But to speak to the other peoples of the world about America—to speak through such new and miraculous channels as short-wave radio—to seek security through understanding rather than through force—that is a new role for our Government.

In the field of short-wave radio beamed abroad, we have not yet decided how best to operate or manage or control; we only know that the Government must put up most of the money to underwrite the cost if a job is to be done.

The American people have deliberately chosen a policy of active participation in world affairs. As a people we are becoming aware of the danger



inherent in that policy. We do not propose to forsake the policy, but we must realize that the danger is greater if America is misunderstood abroad. The next few years—perhaps the next few months—are crucial. The new United Nations Organization will be meeting its first tests. America will be trying to revive world trade on a sound basis. The time to build the kind of peace we want is now, and in the years just ahead.

Yet the plain fact is that as we enter this crucial period America is neither fairly nor fully understood by the peoples of other nations.

America is a legendary country to most of the world. It has been a land of legend through most of its history. The legend has changed from time to time. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, America was a land of freedom; in the nineteenth century, during the great waves of immigration, it was also the land of opportunity.

The American legend today is a curious and contradictory mixture. A legend can hardly be otherwise.

We are known to be immensely strong. Yet Axis propagandists found ready belief for the story that good living had made us so weak and spineless we would not and could not fight.

We are acclaimed as generous and open-handed with billions to spend on lend-lease and rehabilitation—a veritable Uncle Santa Claus. At the same time we are called Uncle Shylock.

We believe in freedom of speech for all, yet sinister capitalists are said to control the means of communication.

We stand for free enterprise, but our critics abroad stress our great combines and monopolies.

The Metropolitan Opera House is the goal of all foreign opera stars, but we are said to have no music except swing.

We believe in due process of law, yet the world pictures the gangsters shooting it out on the streets of Chicago.

Now I am not going to suggest that any role that the Government can play abroad will clarify this picture readily or quickly. Like education, of which it is a part, information is a slow, laborious business that works no miracles and produces no millenium of understanding. It can, however, help to correct mistaken ideas. It can make available the facts about our actions and our policies, as they develop out of our customs, our laws, our institutions, and our politics.

A government information service abroad to strengthen America's voice should, in major cities, include a room or three or four rooms or a building where the ordinary people of Amsterdam or Cairo or Chungking—for example—can go to find out about the United States. During the war we developed small United States libraries in many foreign cities. They were used by newspaper writers, school teachers, doctors, farmers, engineers, students, and people of the street. There is intense curiosity abroad about the United States. I am thinking of the long lines of anxious people who came to our American library of information in Melbourne on the day of President Roosevelt's death. They wanted to know what would happen to our Government. Would we have an immediate election? Who would succeed the President and how and why? Their concern was real and immediate. I am thinking of the foreign youngster who stopped in at an American picture exhibit to ask why the boundaries of our states are so straight. I have in mind a doctor who stops in at the American library in Montevideo to search American medical journals for news of the latest treatment of infantile paralysis. It is a remarkable fact that the British Government's Stationery Office has printed and sold more copies of many American war documents than has our own Government Printing Office. An example is "Target—Germany," the official report of the operations of our Eighth Air Force. British bookshops sold several hundred thousand copies of this report.

A few weeks ago the veteran scholar and world traveler, Henry Seidel Canby, returned from Australia and New Zealand. He reported that our libraries there—I quote—"Have enabled the right people at the right time to learn for themselves, from books and not from propaganda, what America was, is, had, could offer, what we were thinking and how we felt. They and all such institutions should be part of our permanent foreign policy," he said.

Far more important than the rooms, of course, are the books, periodicals, and documents they house. Few of you can have any conception of what these mean, for example, to the liberated people whose only link with us for the past five years has been the radio Voice of America. Let me read a few lines from a letter that came to me from Athens just the other day. My correspondent is a stranger to me, Mr. Nicholas Chantiles. This is what he said: "I knew there was a whole treasure



behind those library doors. Books and magazines full of that unrivaled American democratic spirit, books where the authors are free to express their ideas and beliefs whatever they may be." I confess I was moved by that letter.

In wartime we have discovered, too, the immense value of official American political documents to the newspapers, the scholars, and opinion-makers of other countries—documents which the commercial news services do not cable in full and which, therefore, will be sent abroad only by the Government. Foreign editors ask for the complete texts of presidential speeches, acts of Congress, reports such as General Marshall's on which to base their editorial comments and special articles.

Our Government documentary films have won appreciative audiences abroad. Just the other night I saw a small documentary that has gone overseas, about the jeep. It showed how American ingenuity produced for war a vehicle that has captured the fancy of the whole world. It was a simple but entertaining film. Millions of people in other lands have been instructed by it. It was a piece of information about Americans.

Finally, I should like to tell you briefly what a United States information program should be in terms of people. The bone and marrow of any good program are, of course, the people who run it. There is no substitute for face-to-face relationships. We need only a few hundreds of Government information people abroad, directed on policy by our Ambassadors and available to foreign editors and broadcasters and others. They should be real Americans in the sense that they know America. Having homesteaded in Montana as a boy, I submit to this New York audience that I am personally partial to those who have deep roots and varied experience in rural and western and southern America. With such knowledge of America, they can represent America more faithfully in foreign lands.

Perhaps even more important people, over the long pull, are those we systematically exchange with other countries—the students, professors, technicians, scientists, and others. Here in the United States, such visitors see us as we are and take that story home. They become our friends and remain our friends. Those American students and experts we send abroad to foreign universities and governments go as representatives of our traditions and culture.

These are some of the materials available to the State Department in its efforts to represent the American people in the development of America's voice overseas. Such efforts need not compete with our private businesses operating abroad. They should only supplement and facilitate normal commercial and private communications. They should operate chiefly in those areas where private agencies will not or cannot function profitably. Nor should we conduct vague, well-meaning good-will campaigns. Our information program should be modest, realistic, and candid. America's voice should be neither the big stick nor the super-salesman. The Government's role will represent only a fraction of the great volume of communication between ourselves and our friends abroad—a fraction, but a highly important and indispensable fraction.

Ultimately, there are only two roads to national security. One is sheer physical power. The other is mutual understanding with the other countries of the world. We now need to follow both roads. But we must hope that we shall need to invest less of our resources in military power as we invest more of our thought and attention in the task of mutual understanding.

In an atomic age, understanding, not bombs, is the last, best hope of earth.

## Visit of Prime Minister Attlee

The White House announced on October 30 that Prime Minister Attlee will visit the President at Washington early in November to discuss with him and Prime Minister Mackenzie King of Canada problems to which the discovery of atomic energy has given rise. The Prime Minister is expected to arrive in Washington so that discussions can begin about November 11.

## Oath of Office Taken by Spruille Braden

Spruille Braden took the oath of office as Assistant Secretary of State at ceremonies in the Department of State on October 29, 1945.

# The St. Lawrence Waterway And World Trade

BY EDWARD G. MILLER, JR.<sup>1</sup>

**T**HE PROPOSAL NOW BEFORE Congress that the United States join with Canada in developing the navigation and power phases of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway is the most important and far-reaching project of this kind ever undertaken by two nations. It involves the opening of a deep-water ship channel into the heart of North America, connecting the great and productive midlands of this continent directly with the seaports of the world, and the construction of electric power facilities with a capacity of 2,200,000 horsepower and an average annual output of 13,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity.

This will be the second largest single-dam source of power in the world, being exceeded only by Grand Coulee. The output of the proposed power plant will surpass the output of both hydroelectric and thermoelectric plants in all but eight countries of the world. It will generate as much power as all of the hydroelectric development of the Tennessee Valley area at a lower cost than any plant in the United States, with the possible exception of Niagara.

The completion of this program will be an outstanding example of international cooperation. It will strengthen the traditionally friendly relations between this country and Canada.<sup>2</sup> In the commercial field Canada is this country's second best customer, ranking next to the United Kingdom. We are Canada's best customer.

The over-all cost of developing the water resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin will be shared equally by the United States and Canada. The shipping and hydroelectric power also will be shared equally by the two countries.

The project's economic value to this Nation will rival the TVA and the Panama Canal combined.

From the international viewpoint this project—like the trade-agreements program, the Bretton Woods agreement, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations Organization, and the other instruments of economic cooperation—has an important place in the program to expand world trade and to foster friendly international commercial relations. Domestically, the project will not only be of great benefit to the 50 million people in the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence area, but will also bring long-range benefits to the country as a whole. In addition to the long-range contribution to our national welfare, the undertaking will provide immediate benefits in the form of gainful employment for an estimated average of 20,000 workers a year for four years.

In speaking before the Detroit Board of Commerce on October 24, 1945, Senator George D. Aiken said:

"In any workable plan of post-war full employment and expanding foreign trade, the St. Lawrence Project should be given first priority.

"During the reconversion period, it will provide constructive jobs for tens of thousands of war workers and returning servicemen.

"When completed, it will stimulate agricultural and industrial exports at cheaper rates of transportation.

"It will permit the importation of needed raw materials which we must obtain from abroad because we do not have them here, or because we want to conserve our own.

"Cheap electricity in a region long starved of low-cost power will create new industries, new freight tonnage, new employment and increase purchasing power."

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Miller is Assistant to the Under Secretary of State.

<sup>2</sup> For an article entitled "Canadian-American Cooperation in War and Peace, 1940-45," by Elizabeth Armstrong, see BULLETIN of Oct. 28, 1945, p. 674.

## CURRENT LEGISLATION

The legislation, currently before Congress, was introduced in both houses on October 2 as a joint resolution, providing for approval of the major portions of a 1941 agreement between the United States and Canada to develop the seaway and power project. In the Senate, S.J. Res. 104 was introduced by Senator Barkley for himself and for Senators Wagner, Aiken, La Follette, Ferguson, Langer, Vandenberg, Shipstead, Hill, and Taylor. Seldom has any bill had such strong bipartisan sponsorship. The bill was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In the House, identical resolutions have been introduced by Representatives Sabath, Dingell, Robertson, Dondero, all of which have been referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. It is expected that the measure will first be taken up in the Senate but no date has yet been set for the hearings.

## PRESIDENT URGES "SPEEDY ENACTMENT"

In a message to Congress on October 3, urging the "speedy enactment" of this legislation, President Truman said:

"The St. Lawrence Seaway will make it possible to utilize our war-expanded factories and shipping facilities in the development of international economic cooperation and enlarging world commerce. New and increasing opportunities for production and employment by private enterprise can be expected from this cheap water transportation.

"The completion of the Seaway will bring many benefits to our great neighbor and Ally on the north. The experience of two wars and of many years of peace has shown beyond question that the prosperity and defense of Canada and of the United States are closely linked together.

"By development of our natural water-power resources, we can look forward with certainty to greater use of electricity in the home, in the factory, and on the farm. . . . Increase in the consumption of electricity will mean more comforts on the farms and in city homes. It will mean more jobs, more income, and a higher standard of living. . . ."<sup>1</sup>

## BEFORE PUBLIC MANY YEARS

The question of developing the water resources of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin has been

before the public for many years and has been before Congress several times. Interest in the development of the Seaway dates from the early settlement of the North American Continent. Explorers, pioneers, traders, and ultimately the Governments of the United States and Canada have been attracted by the idea of providing the landlocked Midwest with a deep-water route from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean. To the navigational aspirations of the early settlers has been added the twentieth-century incentive to harness and utilize the enormous volume of potential electric power latent in the rapids of the St. Lawrence River.

During the last 60 years Canada and the United States have spent large sums of money in deepening channels between the Great Lakes. Canada has spent additional sums in building a series of 14-foot canals with 22 locks to by-pass the rapids of the St. Lawrence River between the lower end of Lake Ontario and Montreal. Canada also has spent large amounts of money in the construction of the Welland Canal, skirting Niagara Falls.

The first serious interest in the Seaway on the part of the U.S. Congress was shown in 1916, when the Congress ordered an investigation of its possibilities. Since that time, every President from Wilson to Truman has favored the project.

## MANY STUDIES

Various branches of the Government have made surveys of the project. The Department of Commerce survey in 1941 was the most exhaustive of the eight such studies that have been made. Each of these surveys or studies has favored the project, and each has shown that the navigation and power features of the project will pay for themselves many times over in the savings they will bring.

There have been two serious private studies which reported unfavorably on the project: one issued by the Brookings Institution in 1928, and one issued by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board in the spring of 1940.

On the basis of the studies that have been made and in response to public interest in the development of these water resources, the Governments of the United States and Canada signed, at Washington on July 18, 1932, the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty, providing for the construction of a 27-foot waterway. The treaty then went to the Congress, where extensive hearings

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Oct. 7, 1945, p. 528.



were held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee during 1933. This committee overwhelmingly recommended the ratification of the treaty, but consideration on the floor of the Senate was delayed until March 1934. After extensive debate, the treaty was favored by a majority of 46 to 42 but, lacking the necessary two-thirds vote, failed to be approved.

During the ensuing years there continued to be agitation on the part of the supporters of the project for further steps to realize plans for the development of the St. Lawrence Basin. Accordingly, negotiations were again undertaken with Canada which resulted in the signature of an agreement dated March 19, 1941<sup>1</sup> between the two governments providing for the conclusion of the seaway and power project. The agreement differed in some respects from the earlier treaty, and it was made subject to approval by the Congress of the United States and the Parliament of Canada. It was submitted to the approval of the Congress, and hearings were held before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in the summer and fall of 1941. The main issue during these hearings concerned the economic features of the project. The committee approved the bill by a vote of 17 to 8, but within two weeks after it was reported to the House the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred. This bill, along with other long-range projects, was postponed since priority was given to other war measures.

No further steps were taken toward the approval of the agreement before late in 1944. At that time the Commerce Committee of the Senate held hearings on a bill introduced by Senator Aiken to approve the agreement, but the hearings were confined to the constitutional issue of whether the agreement should be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification as in the case of a treaty. No report was made by the committee. An effort was then made to bring about the approval of the 1941 agreement through an amendment from the floor of the Senate of the pending Rivers and Harbors Bill. This amendment was defeated on December 12, 1944, but many of the Senators who voted against the approval of the agreement made it clear that they were not casting their votes on the merits of the proposal but felt that the agreement should be considered separately and after full hearings.

S. J. Res. 104 and its companion measures in the House again propose the approval of the 1941 agreement but differ somewhat from the earlier measures which have been introduced for this purpose. Particularly, the pending bills would except from the approval of the Congress articles VII and IX of the 1941 agreement, and the bills would express the sense of the Congress that it would be desirable for the President to negotiate separate treaties with reference to the matters covered in these articles. The articles in question relate to the perpetual navigation rights of the ships of the United States and Canada in the waters of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence system, to the maintenance of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls, and to the diversion of water from Niagara River. The exception from approval of these articles is proposed in order to meet objections which have been raised in connection with the constitutional issue on the ground that the subject matter of these articles could be handled only through treaties, since there would be involved the modification of rights established by earlier treaties between the United States and Canada. Also, the joint resolution would authorize the President to investigate the feasibility of making the Seaway self-liquidating.

The joint resolution should, therefore, afford an opportunity for considering the St. Lawrence proposal on its merits.

#### THOSE FOR AND AGAINST THE PROJECT

In the course of the extensive consideration that has been given to the project, many arguments for and against it have been presented by many individuals and groups. Those for the undertaking include government officials, many governors, and mayors; numerous chambers of commerce scattered widely over the north central part of the United States; several national farm organizations, notably the National Grange and the National Farmers Union; and many State farm-bureau organizations. Senator Aiken pointed out to the Senate in 1944 that approximately 700 labor unions—some international, some State, and some local—have endorsed the seaway and power project, including 62 labor unions in the city of Buffalo alone.

The National St. Lawrence Association, organized in 1944, with headquarters in Detroit, has been

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Mar. 22, 1941, p. 307.

particularly active in support of the project. The predecessor of this organization was the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Tidewater Association.

The opposition to the project has come mainly from railroads, lake carriers, power interests, coal and ore interests, and other related groups. Certain chambers of commerce, the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, certain labor unions in transportation and coal mining, and some cities and ports, such as Boston, New York, Buffalo, and New Orleans, have worked against it.

#### RAILROADS AND CARRIERS

Railroads and other carriers have held simultaneously that the Seaway is not needed and will not be used and that it will take away a large portion of their existing business. There is a mass of evidence to show that the Seaway is feasible from the standpoints of both economics and navigation and that it will be used. As for the contention that the Seaway will carve out a big slice of the carriers' existing business, the St. Lawrence survey, conducted by the Department of Commerce in 1941, points to the prospective increase in all freight traffic in the decade beginning in 1950. This increase is estimated at between 242 million and 374 million tons a year greater than the average of 1930-39. The 10 million tons of additional American traffic would be a fraction of the expected increase in shipping. Assuming that the average increase will be 300 million tons for the decade of 1950, the St. Lawrence Seaway would carry only 3 percent of the increase; railroads, highways, airways, and other waterways, 97 percent. Thus it is maintained that the St. Lawrence Seaway is an alternative method of meeting a part of our future transportation requirements.

With reference to the effect of the seaway and power project on the ports of Buffalo, Boston, and New York, the Commerce Department survey reported the following conclusions:

"The study indicates that New York will lose some foreign traffic and that Buffalo will lose some of its grain-transfer business. On the other hand, New York Harbor will acquire new water-borne traffic to and from the Great Lakes area. Similarly, Buffalo also will gain new traffic, both domestic and foreign. In each case, the additional traffic will more than offset the losses. The net gain for Boston will be largest of all."

It was pointed out that this conclusion is based upon the premise that the small amount of trans-

shipment business in foreign commerce which these ports would lose would be compensated by the increased coastwise movement of traffic and the growth of the economic activity of the country as a whole.

As for the fears expressed by other cities, particularly those of the South and Southwest, the survey's analysis concluded that those misgivings are based on the "improbable premise that this country's economy will remain static without any prospect of growth and expansion in the future, and upon an inaccurate analysis of the origin and destination of traffic to and from the Middle West."

Labor is assured by the survey that the increased activity in the Great Lakes ports, stemming from the increase in exports and imports as a result of the deep-water Seaway, would more than offset any displacement of workers due to diversion of traffic from American to foreign bottoms.

The supply of economically usable iron ore in the Great Lakes area is estimated to be sufficient to last only 15 to 20 years. The Commerce Department survey points out that "When the ultimate exhaustion of the Lake Superior resources is in sight, the self-protection of the iron and steel industry in the Great Lakes area requires, as an insurance, the availability of a source of ore other than Lake Superior mines. Low-cost, water-borne transportation via the Seaway would then become an absolute necessity if the steel industry in the Great Lakes area is not to disintegrate. . . ."

#### DIVISION OF COSTS

According to 1941 estimates the proposed seaway and power project will involve the expenditure of an additional \$277,000,000 by the United States and \$144,000,000 by Canada. Canada will be given credit for the \$133,000,000 already spent on the Seaway, principally in the construction of the Welland Canal, which was completed in 1933. The United States has spent only about \$17,000,000, exclusive of certain improvements made after the war started. Of the \$277,000,000 which was the United States share of the project's cost, New York State has offered to repay \$93,373,000 for the power, thus reimbursing the Federal Government for all United States expenditures in connection with the power-development phases of the project. The net cost to be borne by the Federal Government, which applies largely to the Seaway, was estimated in 1941 at approximately \$185,000,000



plus interest during the construction period. The 1941 estimate may have to be increased by about 15 percent to correspond to present-day costs.

Actually, the 2,350-mile Seaway, from Duluth, Minnesota, to the Atlantic Ocean, already exists except for a relatively small section. With the exception of some dredging here and there in the channels connecting the Lakes—principally in the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers—the major portion of the work will entail the construction of a power station, dams, locks, and canals in the St. Lawrence River between Ogdensburg, New York, and Montreal, Canada, a distance of 113 miles.

From the power plant at Massena, New York, the United States share will be 1,100,000 horsepower of electricity, the same as Canada's. Most of New York State and much of New England, both notably lacking in other sources of energy, lie within the area in which this vast supply of energy will be available. Interconnections would make it possible to ship power, in emergencies, as far as Chicago and Washington, D. C.

The energy to be generated at Massena is important, not just because this is the biggest, most productive example of international cooperation ever undertaken in this field, but also because human welfare is tied directly to the availability of energy.

In the early stages of man's development, he relied mainly upon his own exertion or upon draft animals for the energy needed in his daily tasks. His progress toward higher levels of living has been based for the most part upon energy from inanimate sources—coal, oil, fuelwood, gas, and falling water.

Nine tenths of the world's energy is now obtained from these sources; of these, falling water is of especial importance, for, unlike fuels, it satisfies man's energy requirements without impoverishing his resources for the future.

The special value of water power has been recognized in most of the world. Italy, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, New Zealand, and Japan, with little energy available from other sources, have gone far in developing water power as an effective substitute. Countries with abundant resources of coal and other fuels also have developed their water-power resources, particularly in sectors like our Northeast that are remote from other sources of energy. The wisdom of this course is reflected not only in benefits accruing directly to the people from the availability of ample supplies of energy,

but also in the position of our country in the world family of nations. There is abundant evidence that the strength of nations, for peace or for war, is measured largely in terms of their capacity to produce energy and turn it to productive purposes.

The countries that consume large quantities of energy produce most of the world's raw materials, manufacture most of the world's processed goods, and transport most of the world's freight and passengers from one point to another. Before World War II the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and Germany, producing two thirds of the world's energy, provided roughly two thirds of the raw materials, manufactures, and transportation required in the world. This relation was no less true in wartime; for by 1944, when the United States was producing half the world's energy, it was producing half the world's airplanes, tanks, munitions, and other instruments of war.

The deep-water navigation made possible by the St. Lawrence project will help to promote the international trade so desirable to ourselves and so essential to the rest of the world. The power made available by this project will serve the same end—because the welfare of the world will depend to a considerable extent on the international exchange of manufactures and raw materials. Every bit of power that we add to our capacity increases our ability to absorb the world's raw materials and to provide the manufactures needed in areas less fortunately endowed with energy resources.

In the effort to produce more energy in the years ahead, the various nations will be striving toward the more efficient utilization of present sources and will be expanding facilities for utilizing resources hitherto untapped.

The United States has only begun to harness its water resources for the production of hydroelectric power. The proposed St. Lawrence power development would be one of the greatest of its kind in the world. The constant and even flow of power available there has been described as a "power engineer's dream."

#### INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

In commenting on the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project, in a statement to the press on October 4, Under Secretary of State Dean Acheson said:

"... The rapids of the St. Lawrence have al-

(Continued on page 727)



# Meeting of the Preparatory Commission Of the United Nations

## AGREEMENT ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL

[Released to the press by the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations October 23]

After some further discussion unanimous agreement on the report concerning the Security Council was reached at today's meeting of the Executive Committee of the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations.

With a view to clarifying the situation which had arisen as a result of yesterday's discussion, Adlai Stevenson (who acted as chairman) made a statement on behalf of the United States Delegation in which he expressed his conviction that all delegations of the Executive Committee were equally anxious to bring the Security Council as soon as possible into being. Any suggestion, Mr. Stevenson said, that yesterday's discussion has brought out anything which would not conform with this common desire was wholly unwarranted. Unanimous agreement had been reached on the points which were important and the first measures taken which will put at the disposal of the Security Council the force it needs to maintain peace and security. It will be a most historic and significant step forward when the Military Staff Committee meets. For the first time in war or peace the chiefs of staff, or their representatives, of China, France, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States will all meet together, this time to work for the enforcement of lasting peace under the Charter of the United Nations. The peoples of the world are waiting for the Security Council to be established and to begin functioning with an intensity and hope and expectation that is certainly as great as for any of the other organs of the United Nations.

Mr. Stevenson then proposed a new preamble to the report on the Security Council in which article 24 of the Charter is quoted, according to which the members of the United Nations—

"In order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations . . . confer on the Security

Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf."

It is furthermore said in the preamble that the recommendations of the report are made for the purpose of—

" . . . assisting the Security Council to organize itself initially as soon as possible and thus to be in a position to begin promptly the exercise of its responsibilities under the Charter."

The delegates of Australia, United Kingdom, Netherlands, Canada, China, France, Czechoslovakia, and Iran expressed their approval of the United States statement.

Mr. Hasluck (Australia) expressed pleasure that a clear statement of the United States position had been made. He accepted the new text of the preamble as a compromise, though he would still prefer it if the business of the Security Council had been listed rather more fully. He had not been suspicious of the Security Council but had objected to the "hands off" policy which had become apparent in the discussion of the Security Council.

Professor Webster (U.K.) mentioned the importance of the Military Staff Committee and said that his delegation would like to see the Military Staff Committee organized and set up as promptly as possible.

Adrian Pelt (Netherlands) pointed out that, while the United States proposal did not quite meet the point of view of the Netherlands Delegation, he would accept it.

The Executive Committee then adopted the report on the Security Council, and after some further discussion also the report on financial arrangements (Committee 7).

## DISCUSSION ON THE SECRETARIAT

[Released to the press by the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations October 23]

The Committee then took up the report on the arrangements for the Secretariat (Committee 6). Dr. Pelt, presenting the report, said that unanimous agreement had been reached in Committee 6 on parts of the report, whereas other parts were being submitted to the Executive Committee with a two-thirds majority and in one instance only with a single majority.

M. Gromyko (U.S.S.R.) said that his delegation objected to the proposed structure of the Secretariat, being of the opinion that separate secretariats should be established.

Mr. Stevenson (U.S.) offered as a suggestion for possible consideration that the Secretariat should be organized on a basis corresponding to the functions of the principal organs of the United Nations and that each of the organs of the United Nations should always have at its disposal such staff as may be required for the performance of work falling within its competence.

M. Gromyko did not find this proposal acceptable. He said that it did not touch the substance of the matter, and left the fundamental scheme for the organization of the Secretariat unchanged.

Professor Webster said that this fundamental difference could not be resolved by any formula.

The British Delegation had at first been attracted by the Soviet proposal, but on giving it closer attention it found the original scheme to allow for greater efficiency.

M. Massigli (France) said that the Soviet Delegate might like to know why he and other delegates had adopted the original proposal of the report. The reason was that the Soviet proposal would result in an enormous increase in staff and corresponding expenditure.

Referring to one particular point of the report Professor Webster suggested that the proposed department for trusteeship should not be authorized to undertake the work in connection with the suppression of slavery in non-self-governing territories only. Slavery, Professor Webster said, did not exist only in non-self-governing territories, and in drafting the report attention should be given to the fact.

Throughout the discussion the Soviet and Yugoslav Delegates maintained their objections to the proposed scheme for the organization of the Secretariat. The Czechoslovak Delegation abstained on one point, while supporting the Soviet proposal in all other points. The Czechoslovak Delegate (Dr. Kerno) explained that the provision of the one point on which he abstained could be embodied into the Russian proposal.

With these objections noted the report was approved.

## DISCUSSIONS ON THE REPORT ON THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

[Released to the press by the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations October 24]

The Executive Committee met today in almost continuous session with a last meeting convened for 8:30 p.m. to clear up some of the outstanding points on the agenda. Today's discussion was devoted entirely to the report on the General Assembly, which is one of the last two sub-committee reports still awaiting the Executive Committee's approval.

In the report discussed today it was suggested that the General Assembly and the other principal organs of the United Nations should be convened at the earliest possible moment so that prompt attention could be given to the consideration of pressing world problems. For this purpose it was proposed to divide the first session of the General Assembly into two parts: (1) organizational; (2) substantive. It was, however,

pointed out that urgent matters could also be raised at the first part of the General Assembly, which will be held in London early in December.

At the beginning of the meeting the Soviet Delegate, M. Gromyko, announced that he had several observations to make. He first objected to the creation of a special committee to deal with matters concerning the agenda of the General Assembly. This committee, he maintained, was not necessary since its functions could be carried out by the main committee of the General Assembly.

This suggestion met with the approval of most delegates, and it was eventually agreed to transfer agenda questions to the General Committee of the Assembly.

M. Gromyko then expressed doubts as to whether the creation of a special nomination committee was necessary. This led to a prolonged

discussion, in which the Soviet point of view was supported by the delegates of Australia, Mexico, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia, but opposed mainly by the delegates of the Netherlands and China. Professor Webster (U. K.) said that he held no strong views on the subject. He mentioned a document advocating the nomination committee which, in the committee stage, had had strong Soviet support.

[Released to the press by the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations October 25]

After prolonged but unsuccessful attempts at reconciling divergent views on the constitution of the General Assembly the Executive Committee proceeded today to take vote on one of the thorniest problems, that of the composition of the General Committee.

Agreement had been reached on the functions of the General Committee, which would have to assist the General Assembly in directing its work.

M. Gromyko (U.S.S.R.) insisted throughout the discussion, which went on well past midnight yesterday and was continued this morning, that the principle of broad representation by states should be applied in the election of the members of the Committee. He also maintained that the decision about the composition of the General Committee should not be taken now but later on by the Preparatory Commission, so that the problem could be meanwhile studied more thoroughly.

On the other hand, a number of delegates felt that not only the question of equitable geographical distribution but also considerations of personal competence should be a guiding principle for the nomination.

Three votes were taken on the part of the report dealing with the General Committee.

The Soviet point of view was supported by Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia; a compromise proposal was carried, according to which the Soviet amendment as suggested by the minority would be recorded in the report to the Preparatory Commission. France and Iran abstained from the vote.

As a result the original recommendations will go forward to the Preparatory Commission, according to which the General Committee will be composed of a President, seven Vice-Presidents, and the chairmen of the main committees and of the Credentials and Agenda Committees.

After 16 hours of intensive discussion, during which very great but unsuccessful attempts were made to reach unanimity, the Executive Committee adopted tonight the report on the General Assembly. The great bulk of the report was approved, though certain proposals concerning the structure and composition of the committees of the General Assembly did not secure the necessary majority for inclusion among the recommendations going forward to the Preparatory Commission. In such cases the views of both the majority and the minority were explained in footnotes of the report so that the members of the Preparatory Commission would be in a position to understand the issues at stake.

A series of votes was taken in the course of the discussion, with the Soviet, Yugoslav, and Czechoslovak Delegates maintaining their objections to the majority proposals. The delegates of China and France abstained from voting in a number of cases.

At the end of today's meeting it was agreed to suggest to the Preparatory Commission that a planning commission should be established at the earliest possible moment, which should advise the Secretary-General on all arrangements necessary for providing the physical facilities required by the United Nations. The members of the Planning Commission will be nominated by the Secretary-General on an international basis. The chairman of the Commission should be a high official of the United Nations Secretariat, and the members should be recognized experts.

## DISCUSSIONS ON LOCATION OF UNITED NATIONS PERMANENT HEADQUARTERS

[Released to the press by the Preparatory Commission of the United Nations October 26]

The Executive Committee today resumed discussion on the location of the permanent headquarters of the United Nations. Questions still to be settled were those of practical procedure and of choosing a specific site in the United States.

In a memorandum the Executive Secretary had raised the question of whether the Secretary-General, with the bulk of the Secretariat, should pro-



ceed immediately on election to the permanent headquarters or whether, on the contrary, it would be better to make arrangements for some interim regime. The Australian Delegation submitted to the Executive Committee a revised version of the Executive Secretary's paper, and a discussion ensued on which of the recommendations comprised in the two documents should go forward to the Preparatory Commission. Wellington Koo (China), criticizing the Executive Secretary's paper, expressed some concern at the allusion to an internationalized enclave which might be required to accommodate the headquarters of the United Nations. He said that, in view of the fact that the majority of the Executive Committee had voted in favor of the United States, it was questionable whether an internationalized territory should be regarded as a necessary condition.

M. Massigli (France) emphasized that before deciding on the precise site the necessary conditions for it should be laid down.

Professor Webster (U.K.), supporting M. Massigli's point, said that it was necessary to establish these conditions very clearly so that no controversy should arise between the host government and the United Nations.

Mr. Turgeon (Canada) suggested that the Preparatory Commission should take effective steps toward starting negotiations with the United States Government.

Mr. Stevenson (U.S.), replying to a question of the Canadian Delegate, restated the United States Government's attitude toward the setting up of the United Nations headquarters in the United States. He said that the United States had not sought nor would they in future seek for the headquarters of the United Nations to be set up in the United States. This decision must be arrived at by all of the United Nations, free from any influence or pressure on the part of the United States Government. The best evidence of the United States position was indicated by Mr. Stettinius' abstention from voting when the issue was before the Executive Committee. The United States had made it equally clear that it was eager to welcome the United Nations should they choose to select the United States as the permanent seat.

The Executive Committee met later in the afternoon to continue the discussion on the further pro-

cedure for the selection of a place for the United Nations headquarters. A revised recommendation which had meanwhile been prepared by a subcommittee failed to find approval.

The Australian Delegate (Mr. Hasluck) pressed his view that, after having selected the United States, the Executive Committee should turn its attention to the choice of a specific site and the requisite requirements.

M. Massigli (France) objected on the ground that there should be no decision on the site until the draft treaty had been drawn up embodying the requirements necessary for the establishment of the headquarters.

## Ratification of the Charter of The United Nations

[Released to the press October 31]

Since the Charter of the United Nations came into force on October 24, instruments of ratification of that document have been deposited with the Department of State for Greece, India, and Peru.

### Greece

Cimon P. Diamantopoulos, Ambassador of Greece, deposited his Government's instrument of ratification of the Charter on October 25.

### India

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, K.C.S.I., K.B.E., C.I.E., Resident General of India, on October 30 deposited the Indian instrument of ratification of the Charter.

### Peru

Pedro Beltrán, Ambassador of Peru, deposited on October 31 the instrument of ratification of the Charter by Peru.

The fourth paragraph of article 110 of the Charter provides that "The states signatory to the present Charter which ratify it after it has come into force will become original Members of the United Nations on the date of the deposit of their respective ratifications." The Charter is now in force with respect to 32 nations.

# Food and Agriculture Organization

## FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

### SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE EMERGENCY ECONOMIC COMMITTEE FOR EUROPE

**T**HE EMERGENCY ECONOMIC COMMITTEE for Europe consists of representatives of the Governments of Belgium, Denmark, France, Greece, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America. The Governments of Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia are represented by observers. It is hoped that all the European Allies will accept full membership shortly.

The Emergency Economic Committee is an advisory body which has no executive powers and can only act by means of recommendations to its member governments. It provides a place where European governments can consult together and where they can raise questions of production, supply, and distribution which need to be discussed and considered on a common basis. Its objective is to assist countries of Europe to help themselves and to help each other before appealing for outside assistance to the rest of the world.

The Emergency Economic Committee for Europe has set up subcommittees dealing with food and agriculture, industry and materials, public utilities, enemy exportable surpluses. Of these subcommittees, the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee has been the most active.

At the outset of its deliberations, the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee concentrated upon the assistance which could be given to European countries to insure the full harvesting of the 1945 crops and the preparations for sowing for the 1946 harvest. To this end special surveys of immediate requirements for agricultural machinery, tractors, and fertilizers were initiated.

In collecting and correlating the information obtained from European governments, the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee was able to make use of the Combined Working Party.

The Combined Working Party had been set up in 1944 to prepare estimates of the food and agriculture positions in European countries. This

Working Party consisted at the outset of representatives of UNRRA, the United States, and the United Kingdom. At the suggestion of the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee of the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe three representatives of European governments have been added to the Central Committee of the Combined Working Party. Although the Combined Working Party maintains a separate entity, it works in close association with the secretariat of the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe.

The Food and Agriculture Subcommittee has given special consideration to the necessity of adapting to immediate post-war conditions the existing methods of allocation and coordinated purchasing of foodstuffs in world short supply. It has also prepared a series of recommendations regarding the disposal of such European food surpluses as are available. These documents have been submitted to the Combined Food Board with the suggestion that the new proposals should be adopted as part of the international allocation machinery.

The Emergency Economic Committee recommended that representatives of European countries should be added to the Combined Food Board Commodity Committees where such countries had a substantial interest as producers or consumers of the commodities concerned. The Combined Food Board was itself considering a similar suggestion, and invitations have now been issued to a number of European as well as other countries to become members of the Combined Food Board Commodity Committees.

Special attention has been given by the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee to steps which are necessary to see that Combined Food Board allocations are implemented in European countries. Allocations are made, usually, on a quarterly basis. In some cases deliveries do not take place within the expected period. On the other hand, there have been cases where countries have been able to purchase larger quantities of the commodities in question than the formal allocation justifies. The Food and Agriculture Subcommittee has, therefore, established a system whereby the Euro-

## United Nations

pean governments will make periodic returns of the allocated foodstuffs received, so that if there is material delay in the receipt of such foodstuffs the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe can take the matter up with the Combined Food Board or with the supplying countries concerned.

As a part of this work a special Fertilizer Working Committee has been set up on the recommendation of the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee to take over from the Operations Group of the London Fertilizers Committee responsibility for the coordination of all arrangements in Europe necessary to give effect to the efficient production, procurement, and shipment of fertilizers in accordance with the allocations of the Combined Food Board. The Fertilizer Working Committee is not only steering the supplies of fertilizers to where they are needed in Europe; it is also encouraging production of fertilizers in the European countries.

In September the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee organized a conference of food and agriculture statisticians. A separate report is submitted on this conference.

At the beginning of October a European Seeds Conference was held to make recommendations regarding the redistribution of seeds in Europe. It was attended by representatives of European countries needing seeds for their 1946 season and also by countries having supplies of seeds available for export. This conference was attended by the chairman of the Seeds Committee of the Combined Food Board and by representatives of the Control Commissions of occupied territories.

Arrangements have been made for a special European conference to be held in London in October to discuss the question of the infestation of foodstuffs. This conference will be attended by experts from the European countries who will review the measures adopted during the war for destroying rats, mice, and insects whose depredations lead to the loss of enormous quantities of valuable food supplies. The European conference will consider not only what measures the different European countries can take to reduce infestation and loss but also, in that rats, mice, and insects know no national boundaries, what international

measures can be adopted in Europe to safeguard supplies in transit and in warehouses.

A further European conference has been arranged to discuss the new insecticides invented during the period of the war and the benefits these can confer on agriculture and on the preservation and storage of foodstuffs.

Much of the statistical and other information which the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee is collecting in conjunction with the Combined Working Party will be of direct interest to the Food and Agriculture Organization. Arrangements have been made to keep the Interim Commission informed of the activities of the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee, so that, when at a later date the Food and Agriculture Organization itself assumes the responsibilities which are being entrusted to it, it will be able to take up and carry forward much of the work which the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee of the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe has begun.

On the recommendation of the Food and Agriculture Subcommittee of the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe a conference was held in London during the week beginning the 17th September of European food and agriculture statisticians to consider the collection and compilation on comparable bases and the utilization of food and agriculture statistics of the different European countries.

This conference was arranged in association with UNRRA and the Interim Commission, and preliminary plans for the conference were worked out in cooperation with the Combined Working Party.

The conference was attended by representatives of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom, and United States of America. Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and the U. S. S. R. sent observers. Representatives also attended on behalf of UNRRA, the Combined Food Board, the Allied Commissions of Austria, Rome, C. M. F., and the Control Commission in Germany.

The conference concentrated its attention more on the methods and techniques of assembling and analyzing data rather than on the actual statistics themselves. Sources and coverage of the main statistics were reviewed with the object of



elucidating differences of treatment. The occasion was also taken to exchange information on developments resulting from experience gained by individual countries and by individual groups during the war years.

Much had been done before the war to improve and standardize agricultural-production statistics, but little comparable progress had been made in statistical work on the utilization of supplies or on food-consumption levels. Special features of the program were the food-consumption-level inquiry undertaken jointly for their own three countries in 1943 by the United Kingdom, the United States, and Canada, and the studies of the food and agriculture situations in European countries begun early in 1944 by the Combined Working Party on European Food Supplies.

The conference held five plenary sessions at which papers were read and discussed on matters relating to food and agriculture statistics. Five working groups were set up for the discussion, respectively, of the special problems connected with:

1. Cereals, potatoes, sugar, and feedingstuffs
2. Milk, dairy produce, fats, and oils
3. Meat
4. Fish
5. Nutrient factors in foodstuffs generally

The conference was highly successful, partly in regard to the definite recommendations it made and partly in consequence of the personal contacts which were established between members of the Combined Working Party and the statisticians from the European countries.

The conference agreed as to the bases to be adopted for the collection of future statistics and authorized the Combined Working Party to issue as soon as possible suggested definitions of terms currently used in its work. It was further agreed that a digest of European statistics on food and agriculture should be prepared by the Combined Working Party for circulation to the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, the Combined Food Board, UNRRA, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the liaison committees in countries represented at the conference.

It may be said that, as a result of the conference, the Combined Working Party has now been

<sup>1</sup> Made at the plenary session on Oct. 27, 1945. L. B. Pearson, Canadian Ambassador to the U.S., is chairman of the Conference.

definitely established as the recognized authority for collecting and coordinating statistical information regarding food and agriculture in European countries and that the material which it provides should be more rapidly available and enable such organizations as the Emergency Economic Committee for Europe, the Combined Food Board, et cetera, to plan their activities on a more factual foundation than has been possible in the past.

## POSITION OF SOVIET DELEGATION REGARDING FAO

### *Report by the Chairman*<sup>1</sup>

This morning I had a conversation with the head of the Soviet Delegation. He assured me that his Government has the same objectives and sets for itself the same tasks as FAO, that it endorses the idea of international cooperation for the improvement of agricultural production and the bettering of the food situation of the United Nations.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. feels, however, that the organizational forms of FAO still require study. It has also become necessary for the Soviet Union to consult on these questions with those Soviet Union republics which are large producers of agricultural products and agricultural raw materials.

For these reasons the U.S.S.R. is abstaining from becoming a member of the FAO at this time and its representatives will continue to attend the first session of the FAO only as observers.

I know that I am speaking for every member of the Conference when I say that it is our earnest hope that the Government of the U.S.S.R. will soon be able to accept the constitution of the FAO, which is the first of the specialized organizations to be set up under the United Nations. The U.S.S.R., as a member of the United Nations and as one of the nations which has already ratified the Charter, will be greatly interested and concerned in the work of FAO. We hope, therefore, that it will not be long before it expresses that interest by accepting all the rights and obligations of full membership in our organization.

## FINAL PLENARY SESSION

The final plenary session of the Conference on Food and Agriculture of the United Nations, which met in Quebec, was held on November 1.

## U.S. Supply Arrangements for the Middle East

[Released to the press October 30]

The recent joint statement by the United States and the United Kingdom Governments announcing the dissolution of the Middle East Supply Center on November 1, 1945<sup>1</sup> expressed the desire of the two Governments that normal private trading channels be resumed as rapidly as practicable and their desire to assist the governments of the Middle East during the period of transition from wartime restrictions to normal peacetime commercial practices not only in maintaining essential supplies but also in adjusting their economies in an orderly manner to the new conditions.

To achieve these objectives, the United States Government will for the time being continue the office of the regional Economic Counselor in Cairo, with such staff as is required, to assist the Middle East countries in meeting their essential needs for commodities from the United States remaining in short supply. This office will at all times work in close conjunction with American officers at the various diplomatic posts in the Middle East. Questions relating to the supply of scarce commodities from British-controlled sources should, of course, be addressed to the British Supply Mission (Middle East), with which the office of the regional Economic Counselor will maintain close relations.

The only limits imposed by United States regulations on the export of commodities from the United States, now that the shipping situation has been relieved, will be those necessitated by supply shortages. On September 10, 1945 the United States supply authorities placed most commodities under "general license", which means that they can be exported without restriction.<sup>2</sup> There remains a limited group of commodities of which the supply is still such as to require some export restriction and forward programming in order to insure a fair world-wide distribution taking into account the needs of liberated areas.

This group of commodities which the United States still subjects to export-licensing control is made up primarily of foodstuffs but also includes

leather and some leather manufactures, rubber and a few rubber products (including tires), a very limited list of drugs and chemicals, cotton textiles and yarn, lumber and sawmill products, newsprint, a few petroleum products, a selected list of iron and steel manufactures, lead and tin, trucks and passenger cars, and fertilizers. Certain of these, principally in the field of foodstuffs, the United States is for the present unable to supply. A list of commodities unavailable from the United States will be communicated to the Middle East governments within the next few days. With respect to the remainder, it is anticipated the steady improvement in the supply situation in the United States will make it possible to meet Middle East demands within reasonable limits.

Where allocations are necessary they will be established and administered by export-licensing authorities in the United States. The appropriate officials of the Middle East governments will be kept fully informed of such restrictions. No grading or reviewing of individual import licenses will be undertaken by United States authorities either in Washington or in the Middle East.

Communications with the local governments on allocations and other matters relating to imports from the United States will be through the United States diplomatic missions in the area, which will work in close conjunction with the office of the regional Economic Counselor in carrying out the desire of the American Government to assist the Middle East countries in meeting the problems of transition to peacetime conditions of trade.

---

MILLER—Continued from page 719.

ways constituted a natural barrier to our foreign trade. At a time when we are making every effort to clear the channels of world commerce as a step toward world peace, we should remove this natural barrier. . . .

"For well over a century the United States and Canada have worked together in peace and partnership. One of the few pending matters between the two countries is the approval of the 1941 agreement with Canada providing for the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Sept. 30, 1945, p. 493.

<sup>2</sup> BULLETIN of Sept. 16, 1945, p. 397.

<sup>3</sup> BULLETIN of Oct. 7, 1945, p. 529.

## Far Eastern Advisory Commission

### ADVISERS TO UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE

[Released to the press October 29]

The Department of State announced on October 29 that Mr. Erle R. Dickover and Col. C. Stanton Babcock will be advisers to Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy, United States Representative on the Far Eastern Advisory Commission. Mr. Dickover was formerly Chief of the Division of Japanese Affairs in the Department.

### APPOINTMENT OF TEMPORARY SECRETARY

[Released to the press October 29]

The Honorable Nelson T. Johnson, formerly United States Ambassador to China and Minister to Australia, has been appointed temporary Secretary of the Far Eastern Advisory Commission.

### APPOINTMENT OF INDIAN REPRESENTATIVE

[Released to the press October 29]

The Government of India has accepted the invitation of the United States Government to attend the meeting of the Far Eastern Advisory Commission. The Indian Resident General in Washington, Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, has been appointed as his country's representative on the Commission.

### LIST OF REPRESENTATIVES

#### AUSTRALIA

Dr. H. V. Evatt, *Minister for External Affairs*

#### CANADA

Mr. Lester B. Pearson, *Canadian Ambassador in Washington*

#### CHINA

Dr. Wei Tao-ming, *Chinese Ambassador in Washington*

#### FRANCE

Mr. P. E. Naggiar, *Former French Ambassador to China and Russia*

#### GREAT BRITAIN

Lord Halifax, *British Ambassador in Washington*

*Alternate:* Sir George Sansom, *Minister Counselor of British Embassy, Washington*

<sup>1</sup> Held in Washington on Oct. 30, 1945.

<sup>2</sup> The President received representatives of the participating nations at the White House on Oct. 30, 1945 at 11:15 a.m.

#### INDIA

Sir Girja Shankar Bajpai, *Indian Resident General in Washington*

#### NETHERLANDS

Dr. A. Loudon, *Netherlands Ambassador in Washington*

#### NEW ZEALAND

Mr. C. A. Berendsen, *New Zealand Minister in Washington*

#### PHILIPPINES

Brig. Gen. Carlos Romulo, *Resident Commissioner of the Philippines*

*Alternate:* Mr. Tomas Confesor, *Member of Filipino Rehabilitation Commission*

#### UNITED STATES

Maj. Gen. Frank R. McCoy

### OPENING SESSION <sup>1</sup>

#### Statement by THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Released to the press October 30]

It is a pleasure to follow the President in extending a cordial welcome to you who have been designated by your governments to meet together to consider the non-military problems involved in implementing Japan's instrument of surrender.<sup>2</sup>

From the beginning of the war it has been the purpose of the United States Government that this great struggle should be won and the resulting peace should be maintained by the cooperation and the joint action of the United Nations concerned.

Immediately after the surrender of Japan this Government proposed the establishment of this Commission.

I am happy that today you have met to organize and make plans for the future.

It is the hope of our Government that there should be adopted measures adequate to effect the military security of peaceful nations and at the same time to bring about such a change in the spirit and the ambitions of the Japanese Government and people that in the future Japan may live in peaceful association with other nations.

To create conditions which will facilitate this transformation in Japan will require the utmost wisdom, and not only wisdom, but understanding, tolerance, and faith.

The establishment of an advisory commission with as many members and of the character of this Commission is an interesting experiment.



Representing different governments, it is certain that you have varying interests and varying views about the problems involved in the occupation of Japan. In order to function effectively it will be necessary that each representative should be willing to sympathetically consider the viewpoint of his colleagues and in a spirit of cooperation make concessions to each other.

While I know the task may be a difficult one, I am sure that the Commission will function with efficiency. My confidence is based upon the thought that if we could cooperate to win the war we certainly should be able to cooperate in implementing the terms of surrender.

I shall now ask General Frank McCoy, the representative of the United States on this Commission, to act as temporary chairman.

**Motion Presented by CHINESE REPRESENTATIVE**

The following motion was presented by Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Representative of China on the

Far Eastern Advisory Commission, at its opening session on October 30, 1945:

"In view of the fact that new suggestions have been made with regard to the terms of reference of this Commission and that they are being examined by the United States, China, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union, the four powers which initiated the invitations for this Commission to meet, the Chinese Delegation believes that it will be advantageous to the progress and outcome of this Conference if the said powers are allowed sufficient time to continue their discussions with a view to reaching an agreement before the Conference proceeds further. Besides, there are so many documents which have just been distributed that all the delegations would certainly need time to study.

I move, therefore, that for these purposes the Conference be adjourned for one week to be re-assembled on November 6, 1945."

## Japanese Reparations Mission

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT**

[Released to the press by the White House November 1]

The President announced on November 1 that Ambassador Edwin W. Pauley, the personal representative of the President on reparations matters, would leave for the Far East early this month for the purpose of developing a program for exacting reparations from Japan. The President announced at the same time the members of Ambassador Pauley's staff who will accompany him.

In making the announcement the President said:

"The problem of what to do with Germany and Japan is one of the greatest challenges in the whole effort to achieve lasting peace.

"The program for reparations from Germany which was developed by Ambassador Pauley and adopted at the Berlin Conference will go a long way toward helping us achieve complete victory over Germany, by depriving her of the means ever again to wage another war. The reparations program which Ambassador Pauley will develop for Japan will be directed toward the same fundamental goal—to put an end for all time to Japanese aggression.

"In carrying out this mission for me Ambassador Pauley and his staff will work in close cooperation with General MacArthur and his staff and will make full use of the surveys which have already been made by the industrial experts now on General MacArthur's staff."

**MEMBERS OF THE MISSION**

EDWIN W. PAULEY, Personal Representative of President and Chief of Mission

MARTIN T. BENNETT, industrial engineer

Lt. Col. G. S. CARTER, chief of secretariat

Dr. ARTHUR G. COONS, special adviser to Chief of Mission

JOSHIAH E. DUBOIS, counsel and financial adviser

LUTHER H. GULICK, adviser on government and administration

Comdr. J. P. HURNDALL, resources consultant

DAVID R. JENKINS, agricultural economist

WILLIAM GREEN JOHNSTON, industrial consultant

STANLEY E. JOINER, secretary

CHARLES KARL, secretary

OWEN LATTIMORE, chief economist

Sgt. JOHN MATTLES, secretary

H. D. MAXWELL, special assistant to Chief of Mission

BENJAMIN OLSEN, secretary

## Directive from General MacArthur to the Imperial Japanese Government

1. In order to remove restrictions on political, civil and religious liberties and discrimination on grounds of race, nationality, creed or political opinion, the Imperial Japanese Government will:

a. Abrogate and immediately suspend the operation of all provisions of all laws, decrees, orders, ordinances and regulations which:

(1) Establish or maintain restrictions on freedom of thought, of religion, of assembly and of speech, including the unrestricted discussion of the Emperor, the Imperial Institution and the Imperial Japanese Government.

(2) Establish or maintain restrictions on the collection and dissemination of information.

(3) By their terms or their applications, operate unequally in favor of or against any person by reason of race, nationality, creed or political opinion.

b. The enactments covered in Paragraph a, above, shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following:

(1) The peace preservation law (Chian Iji Ho, law number 54 of 1941, promulgated on or about 10 March 1941).

(2) The protection and surveillance law for thought offense (Shiso Han Hogo Kansatsu Ho, law number 29 of 1936, promulgated on or about 29 May 1936).

(3) Regulations relative to application for protection and surveillance law for thought offense (Shiso Han Hogo Kansoku Ho Shiko Rei, Imperial ordinance number 401 of 1936, issued on or about 14 November 1936).

(4) Ordinance establishing protection and surveillance stations (Hogo Kansoku-Jo Kaneica Imperial ordinance number 403 of 1936, issued on or about 14 November 1936).

(5) The precautionary detention procedure (Ministry of Justice order, Shihosho Rei, number 50, issued on or about 14 May 1941).

(7) The national defense and peace preservation

law (Kikubo Hoan Ho, law number 49 of 1941, promulgated on or about 7 March 1941).

(8) National defense and peace preservation law enforcement order (Kokubo Hoan Ho Shiko Rei, Imperial ordinance number 542 of 1941, issued on or about 7 May 1941).

(9) Regulations for appointment of lawyers under peace preservation laws (Bengoshi Shitei Kitei, Ministry of Justice order, Shihosho Rei, number 47 of 1941, issued on or about 9 May 1941).

(10) Law for safeguarding secrets of military material resources (Gunyo Shigen Himitsu Hogo Ho, law number 25 of 1939, promulgated on or about 25 March 1939).

(11) Ordinance for the enforcement of the law for safeguarding secrets of military material resources (Gunyo Shigen Himitsu Hogo Ho Shiko Tei, Imperial Ordinance number 413 of 1939, issued on or about 24 June 1939).

(12) Regulations for the enforcement of the law of safeguarding secrets of military material resources (Gunyo Shigen Himitsu Hogo Ho Shiko, Kisaku Ministries of War and Navy ordinance number 3 of 1939, promulgated on or about 26 June 1939).

(13) Law for the protection of military secrets (Gunki Hogo Ho, law number 72 of 1937, promulgated on or about 17 August 1937, revised by law number 58 of 1941).

(14) Regulations for the enforcement of the law for the protection of military secrets (Gunki Hogo Ho Shiko Kisku, Ministry of War ordinance number 59, issued on or about 12 December 1939 and revised by Ministry of War ordinance numbers 6, 12 and 58 of 1941).

(The religious body law (Shukyo Dentai Ho, law number 77 of 1939, promulgated on or about 8 April 1939).

(16) All laws, decrees, orders, ordinances and regulations amending, supplementing or implementing the foregoing enactments).

c. Release immediately all persons now detained, imprisoned, under "protection or surveillance", or whose freedom is restricted in any other

manner who have been placed in that state of detention, imprisonment, "protection and surveillance", or restriction of freedom:

- (1) Under the enactments referred to in Para 1 a and b above.
- (2) Without charge.
- (3) By charging them technically with a minor offense, when, in reality, the reason for detention, imprisonment, "Protection and Surveillance", or restriction of freedom, was because of their thought, speech, religion, political beliefs, or assembly. The release of all such persons will be accomplished by 10 October 1945.

d. Abolish all organizations or agencies created to carry out the provisions of the enactments referred to in Para 1 a and b above and that part of, or functions of, other offices or sub divisions of other civil departments or organs which supplement or assist them in the execution of such provisions. These include, but are not limited to:

- (1) All secret police organs.
- (2) Those departments in the Ministry of Home Affairs, such as the Bureau of Police, charged with supervision of publications, supervision of public meetings and organizations, censorship of motion pictures, and such other departments concerned with the control of thought, speech, religion or assembly.
- (3) Those departments, such as the special higher police (Tokubetsu, Koto, Keisatsu Bu), in the Tokyo Metropolitan Police, the Osaka Metropolitan Police, and other Metropolitan Police, the Police of the Territorial Administration of Hokkaido and the various prefectural police charged with supervision of publications, supervision of public meetings and organizations, censorship of motion pictures, and such other departments concerned with the control of thought, speech, religion or assembly.
- (4) Those departments, such as the Protection and Surveillance Commission, and all Protection and Surveillance Stations responsible thereto under the Ministry of Justice charged with protection and surveillance and control of thought, speech, religion, or assembly.

e. Remove from office and employment the Minister of Home Affairs, the Chief of the Bureau of Police of the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Chief of the Tokyo Metropolitan Police Board, the Chief of Osaka Metropolitan Police Board, the Chief of

any other Metropolitan Police, the Chief of Police of the Territorial Administration of Hokkaido, the Chiefs of each prefectural police department, the entire personnel of the special higher police of all metropolitan, territorial and prefectural police departments, the guiding and protecting officials and all other personnel of the Protection and Surveillance Commission and of the Protection and Surveillance Stations. None of the above persons will be reappointed to any position under the Ministry of Home Affairs, the Ministry of Justice or any police organ in Japan. Any of the above persons whose assistance is required to accomplish the provisions of this directive will be retained until the directive is accomplished and then dismissed.

f. Prohibit any further activity of police officials, members of police forces, and other government, national or local, officials or employees which is related to the enactments referred to in Para 1 a and b above and to the organs and functions abolished by Para 1 d above.

g. Prohibit the physical punishment and mistreatment of all persons detained, imprisoned, or under protection and surveillance under any and all Japanese enactments, laws, decrees, orders, ordinances and regulations. All such persons will receive at all times ample sustenance.

h. Ensure the security and preservation of all records and any and all other materials of the organs abolished in Para 1 d. These records may be used to accomplish the provisions of this directive, but will not be destroyed, removed, or tampered with in any way.

i. Submit a comprehensive report to this Headquarters not later than 15 October 1945 describing in detail all action taken to comply with all provisions of this directive. This report will contain the following specific information prepared in the form of separate supplementary reports:

(1) Information concerning persons released in accordance with Para 1 c above. (To be grouped by prison or institution in which held or from which released or by office controlling their protection and surveillance).

(a) Name of person released from detention or imprisonment or person released from protection and surveillance, his age, nationality, race and occupation.

(b) Specification of criminal charges against



each person released from detention or imprisonment or reason for which each person was placed under protection and surveillance.

(c) Date of release and contemplated address of each person released from detention or imprisonment or from protection and surveillance.

(2) Information concerning organizations abolished under the provisions of this directive:

(a) Name of organization.

(b) Name, address, the title of position of persons dismissed in accordance with Para 1 e.

(c) Description by type and location of all files, records, reports, and any and all other materials.

(3) Information concerning the prison system and prison personnel.

(a) Organization chart of the prison system.

(b) Names and location of all prisons, detention centers and jails.

(c) Names, rank and title of all prison officials (governors and assistant governors, chief and assistant chief wardens, wardens and prison doctors).

(4) Copies of all orders issued by the Japanese Government including those issued by the governors of prisons and prefectural officials in effectuating the provisions of this directive.

2. All officials and subordinates of the Japanese Government affected by the terms of this directive will be held personally responsible and strictly accountable for compliance with and adherence to the spirit and letter of this directive.

## Pearl Harbor Investigation

[Released to the press October 31]

At his press and radio news conference on October 31, the Secretary of State called attention to the portion of the report of the Army Pearl Harbor Board which referred to Secretary Hull and which was released to the press on August 29, 1945.

The Secretary cited that section of the report (page 223) which states "Evidently the action 'to kick the whole thing over' was accomplished by presenting to the Japanese the counterproposal of the 'Ten Points'<sup>1</sup> which they took as an ultimatum. It was the document that touched the button that started the war, as Ambassador Grew so aptly expressed it." The Secretary also cited a later reference in the report (page 224) that "It seems well established that the sending of this 'Ten Point' memorandum by the Secretary of State was used by the Japanese as a signal of starting the war by the attack on Pearl Harbor."

Mr. Byrnes called attention to the Navy League speech of Secretary Forrestal of October 27 in New York, which Mr. Byrnes said was based upon documents found on the Japanese heavy cruiser *Nachi*, which was sunk in the harbor of Manila Bay. Those documents included the original plans for the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Secretary added, and disclosed the following: The operation

plan providing for the outbreak of the war and the attack on Pearl Harbor was published on the 5th of November, 1941 as Combined Fleet Top Secret Operation Number One and Y-Day was set in Combined Fleet Top Secret Number Two published on November 7, 1941, which fixed the 8th of December, 1941, Japanese time, and the 7th of December, 1941, United States time, as Y-Day.

At the request of correspondents, Secretary Byrnes authorized the following comment for direct quotation:

"The so-called ultimatum of Secretary Hull was dated the 26th of November and I call attention to these original documents of the Japanese in the hope that it may forever dispose of the claim of the statement of the Army Board that the so-called ultimatum of Secretary Hull started the Japanese war. It was three weeks before Mr. Hull gave his 'Ten Point' memorandum to the representatives of Japan that official orders were given that the Japanese Fleet should attack on the 7th of December. I may say that you will all be glad to know that the Secretary of State did not start the war with the ultimatum, but three weeks before that, the Japanese had given orders to attack on December 7th and I wanted to dispose of that in justice to my good friend Secretary Hull."

<sup>1</sup> See *Peace and War, U. S. Foreign Policy 1931-1941*, Department of State publication 1983, p. 811.

## Departure from Shanghai of the S.S. "Lavaca"

[Released to the press October 31]

The Department of State has received from the American Consulate General at Shanghai a list of civilian personnel which left Shanghai on board the S.S. *Lavaca* on October 13, 1945. The ship is expected to arrive at San Francisco on November 2. The names of the passengers are listed in press release 821. The following table is a summary of the passenger list by countries:

Nationality	Number
American	173
British	87
Canadian	29
French	23
Swiss	17
Chinese	8
Swedish	8
Portuguese	6
Netherlands	5
Egyptian	3
Belgian	1
Total	360

## Dickson Reck Returns From China

[Released to the press November 2]

Dickson Reck, specialist in industrial standards, organization, and management, who has been for the past year in China under the cultural-cooperation program of the Department of State, has recently returned to the United States. Mr. Reck accompanied S. T. Shang, Secretary-General of the Chinese Standards Committee, to the meeting of the United Nations Standards Coordinating Committee held in New York on October 8. During the next three months Mr. Reck and Mr. Shang will visit American standardizing agencies, engineering societies, and manufacturing plants to arrange for the transmission of technical data and American specifications to the Chinese Standards Committee. Mr. Shang is also instructed by the Chinese Government to become familiar with American methods of developing and extending standards into industrial and agricultural production and distribution practice and to get a

first-hand impression of American production methods in order to facilitate the development of standards in China.

Mr. Reck assisted the Chinese Government in organizing their national standards organization, in developing the methods and procedures for establishing standards, and in building a program of standards development work.

## Areas Opened for Civilian Travel

[Released to the press October 30]

The Joint Chiefs of Staff with the concurrence of the Secretary of State have removed all areas except Germany, Austria, the main islands of Japan, Formosa, Nansei Shoto and Nanpo Shoto, and Korea from the list of areas of active operations into or through which civilians may not go without a military permit.

The approval of the Supreme Allied Commander, Southeast Asia, must be obtained, however, for civilian travel in the Southeast Asia Command, which comprises Burma, Siam (Thailand), Malaya, Sumatra, Java, Borneo, Celebes, New Guinea, and the Solomon Islands. This approval is obtained by the State Department from the Supreme Allied Commander, Southeast Asia.

Although military control of travel has been greatly diminished, the critical situation with regard to living conditions and transportation continues to prevail in areas formerly under military control as well as in other European and Asiatic areas. Consequently, Americans are advised to undertake only the most essential travel this winter, bearing in mind that all liberated countries are suffering from lack of heat, housing, and transportation and have acute shortages of food. Furthermore, transportation to the United States is difficult to obtain in most instances owing to the movement homeward of American military forces, and civilian travelers may therefore expect a delay of from six months to a year in returning to the United States.

Passport applications will be accepted for the areas listed as under military control only in cases of strong national interests. Passport applications for travel to other areas are discouraged, as

indicated above, and should be restricted to those persons having urgent and compelling business or personal reasons for proceeding abroad.

The clerks of Federal courts throughout the country are being furnished with detailed information regarding civilian travel in critical areas, and those desiring to avail themselves of such information should make inquiry to the clerk of the nearest Federal court. American diplomatic and consular officers abroad will continue to render all possible help under existing conditions to American businessmen traveling in the national interest.

## Mail Service to Italy

[Released to the press November 1]

The Department of State announced on November 1 that expanded parcel-post and regular mail service will become available to Italy and the Vatican City as of November 2, 1945. The extended service will be available to all of Italy except the provinces of Trieste, Gorizia, Fiume, Pola, and Zara. However, gift parcels may be sent to the cities of Trieste, Gorizia, and Pola.

Gift parcels up to 11 pounds in weight are now acceptable for dispatch to the above-designated localities. Only one parcel may be sent by the same sender to the same addressee in Italy during any 7-day period. Packages may not exceed \$25 in value and must be conspicuously marked "gift parcel". The customs declaration must clearly indicate the contents and value of each parcel. Only one declaration is required for each parcel. Packages may contain only such items as are not prohibited in the international mails to Italy and must conform to the regulations established by the Foreign Economic Administration.

Regular mail service has been extended to all of Italy with the exception of the five provinces of Trieste, Gorizia, Fiume, Pola, and Zara and now comprises letters, postcards, printed matter in general, printed matter for the blind, commercial papers, and samples of merchandise. Airmail articles for these areas may not exceed one pound. First-class matter may be registered, but special-delivery service is not available at this time.

Regular mail service to the five provinces above mentioned is still restricted to postcards and letters weighing not more than two ounces for dispatch by air and surface means.

## Hungarian Minister to the United States

[Released to the press November 2]

The United States Government has informed the Hungarian Provisional Government that it is agreeable to the appointment of Aladar de Szegedy-Maszak as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary from Hungary to the United States.

## Recognition of Government Of Venezuela

[Released to the press October 30]

Secretary of State Byrnes announced on the afternoon of October 30 that the Government of the United States has extended full recognition to the Government of Venezuela, which is now organized under Señor Rómulo Betancourt.

The American Ambassador in Caracas informed the new Minister for Foreign Affairs of Venezuela of this action.

Before making its decision to recognize the new Government of Venezuela the Government of the United States of America exchanged views and consulted with the governments of the other American republics.

## Normal Relations With New Brazilian Administration

[Released to the press November 3]

The Secretary of State announced on November 2 that the American Ambassador at Rio de Janeiro, Adolf A. Berle, Jr., was instructed to carry on normal relations with the new administration in Brazil. He stated further that the question of recognition did not arise since established procedures were followed in the assumption of the executive power by the President of the Federal Supreme Court of Brazil. The Secretary added that consultation with other American republics reflects general agreement with this position.



## Postscripts on the Third Inter-American Radiocommunications Conference

By ROBERT R. BURTON and DONALD R. MACQUIVEY<sup>1</sup>

**A**S RADIO COMMUNICATIONS ARE developed in the next few years, the related problems will be met with greater ease, partially because of the success of the Third Inter-American Radiocommunications Conference.

In 1937 the First Inter-American Radio Conference was convened in Habana, Cuba, to draw up a basic radio agreement (called the Inter-American Radiocommunications Convention), regulations in the form of an Inter-American Arrangement Concerning Radiocommunications, and a North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement. The Second Inter-American Radio Conference was held in Santiago, Chile, in 1940 and the Habana arrangement, which further implemented the basic agreements of the Habana convention, was revised. The Third Inter-American Radio Conference,<sup>2</sup> which was scheduled to be held in Rio de Janeiro in 1943 but which was delayed by the war, opened on September 3, 1945 and concluded its discussions on September 25. The signing of the Inter-American Radiocommunications Convention took place on September 27, 1945.

At the opening sessions of the Conference, it was decided to create four major committees:

1. Initiatives
2. Juridical-Administrative
3. Technical
4. Drafting

The Initiatives Committee considered all proposals from the various delegations and apportioned them either to the Juridical-Administrative Committee or to the Technical Committee. The Juridical-Administrative Committee handled the bulk of the work of redrafting the Habana convention to bring it down to date. The Technical Committee concerned itself with frequency allo-

cations and other technical problems. The Drafting Committee prepared the final documents in English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese.

Within the Juridical-Administrative Committee four subcommittees were created to deal with problems on organization, rates, miscellaneous administrative questions, and freedom of information. Adolf A. Berle, Jr., American Ambassador to Brazil, was especially active in the work of the Subcommittee on Freedom of Information, which handled such items as interchange of cultural broadcast programs, interchange of news and information, rights in broadcasts, and radio communications to multiple destinations. These subjects were subsequently incorporated into the Rio de Janeiro convention as articles 25 to 28, inclusive.

The United States Delegation to the Conference consisted of representatives of the Departments of State, War, Navy, and Commerce, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Office of Inter-American Affairs. Ambassador Berle was chairman.

For many months prior to the Conference, the American Delegates and other interested participants had made a thorough study of the Habana convention for the purpose of revising it to suit present needs. As a result of this preparation, the American Delegation was able, shortly after the opening of the Conference, to lay before the other delegations a revised text of the Habana convention, in English, Spanish, and Portuguese.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Burton is Chief of the Radio Overseas Utilization Section, International Information Division, Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, Department of State. Mr. Burton was a member of the U. S. Delegation.

Mr. MacQuivey is Divisional Assistant, Telecommunications Division, Office of Transport and Communications Policy, Department of State.

<sup>2</sup> See "Third Inter-American Radio Conference", by Harvey B. Otterman, BULLETIN of Aug. 26, 1945, p. 292.

The immediate effect was to focus the thinking of all the delegations on the changes proposed. The outcome was the unanimous adoption of most of these proposals. Compromises were made on those portions of the revised convention which did not receive unanimous approval so that the final draft was acceptable to all parties.

The principal accomplishments of the Conference were:

- (1) the signing, on September 27, 1945, of a telecommunications convention;
- (2) adoption of regulations for future conferences;
- (3) adoption of a series of resolutions and recommendations; and
- (4) laying of the groundwork for a world telecommunications conference, so far as the American republics are concerned.

Of these, the only legally enforceable instrument is the convention, which must be ratified before it takes effect.

The convention includes a definition of the "American Region", wherein it will apply. Provision is made for the organization and operation of an Office of Inter-American Telecommunications (O.I.T.). This office would be a central repository and disseminating agency for information concerning inter-American telecommunications and would perform many of the functions for the Americas comparable with the responsibility on a world-wide basis of the Bureau of the International Telecommunication Union, located at Bern, Switzerland.

A new conference procedure involving three types was set up, which makes provision for relatively infrequent plenipotentiary conferences for the consideration of basic policies and the revision of inter-American telecommunications conventions, for administrative conferences at more frequent intervals to consider matters implementing the convention adopted at the plenipotentiary conferences, especially in the technical field, and for emergency conferences, which may be called on reasonably short notice, to consider specific urgent problems in restricted fields. Such meetings will be known as administrative conferences with limited agenda.

Finally, the Conference included in the convention, among other things, principles for the use of radio frequencies, principles regarding the establishment of rates, and arbitration procedure to

be followed in the event of disagreement. No priorities were set up regarding the type of service which would have first call on the use of radio frequencies, but it was recognized that the emergency services and those for which no other means of communication can be provided should be given primary consideration.

Considerable attention was given to the interchange of cultural, news, and information broadcast programs. The O.I.T. is to have a separate department to consider such problems.

The regulations attached to the convention provide specific details such as the set-up of future conferences, organization and membership of committees, their duties, and voting procedures.

Only two resolutions were adopted. One of these indicated that it was desirable to separate those problems of interest only to aviation from consideration in detail by the general telecommunications body, and to leave these details to the appropriate aviation organization. The other resolution regarded freedom of information in radio communications and recommended that regulations be adopted permitting free interchange of information in accordance with the American democratic views on the subject.

Several recommendations were adopted. These called for:

- (1) a broadcast conference to be held sometime soon after the world telecommunications conference;
- (2) a study of very-high-frequency (vhf) broadcasting to be conducted;
- (3) transmission of telecommunications information to the International Civil Aeronautics Organization;
- (4) a joint meeting of American region commissions of the International Meteorological Organization to consider its telecommunication needs;
- (5) definition of "meteorological telecommunications";
- (6) organization of an inter-American network of monitoring stations;
- (7) all broadcast receivers to cover the frequency range 535 kc to 1605 kc;
- (8) all American countries to adopt standard zone time, using only the time for meridians which are multiples of 15 degrees from the Greenwich meridian;
- (9) reduction in telecommunications rates;

- (10) elimination of special taxes;
- (11) expedition of press messages;
- (12) over-all study of rates; and
- (13) standardization in the American region of instruction of radio operators and technicians.

Subjects brought up for study preparatory to the next world conference included means whereby the speed of airline communication might be increased, training of amateurs who wish to operate radiotelephone equipment in the 14-megacycle band, a new frequency allocation list proposed by the United States, and the proposed Central Frequency Registration Board.

The United States Delegation felt that the Conference was very successful. It not only enabled representatives of the American republics to agree on the subjects discussed above but also provided a means for them to become better acquainted personally and to discuss mutual problems informally. No effort was made to develop a "hemisphere bloc" to act as a unit at the world conference. In fact, the expression of individual national views is encouraged. The objective—a better understanding of inter-American problems—was accomplished. As a result, much time and effort should be saved when the world telecommunications conference convenes.

## Meeting of Anglo-American Caribbean Forestry Committee

According to the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission, a meeting of the Forestry Subcommittee of the Research Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, Fisheries, and Forestry of the Caribbean Research Council will be held in Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, January 14-24, 1946.

In addition to attendance by members of the subcommittee, invitations have been extended to the governments concerned for the attendance of at least one forester from each of the following Caribbean territories: Trinidad and Tobago (representing also Barbados and the Windward and Leeward Islands), British Guiana, British Honduras, Jamaica, Martinique, Guadeloupe, Netherlands Guiana, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The three island republics of Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic have also been invited to send forestry experts as observers to the meeting.

The meeting will deal on a technical level with forest problems in the Caribbean region and will

- (1) examine the present status of forest research,
- (2) determine future needs in such research, and
- (3) formulate for the consideration of the Caribbean Research Council and the Anglo-American Caribbean Commission a program of future research and development.

## Transmittal of U.S.-U.K. Petroleum Agreement to the Senate<sup>1</sup>

### Message of THE PRESIDENT

[Released to the press by the White House November 1]

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, if it approve thereof, I transmit herewith an agreement on petroleum between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, signed in London September 24, 1945.

With the agreement I transmit for the information of the Senate the report made to me by the Secretary of State relating thereto, together with a copy of a letter addressed to me by the Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Administrator for War relating to the agreement, and also a list of territories to which the agreement is intended to apply.

HARRY S. TRUMAN

## THE DEPARTMENT

### Alien Enemy Control Section

[Released to the press November 2]

By Departmental order effective October 24, the Secretary of State has established under Assistant Secretary Braden an Alien Enemy Control Section to handle the cases of enemy aliens who were brought to this country from other American republics during the course of the war and remain in the custody of this Government. The directive provides for the establishment of an orderly

<sup>1</sup> For text of the agreement, see BULLETIN of Sept. 30, 1945, p. 481. Enclosures not printed.



procedure for disposing of these cases on an individual basis in accordance with standards to be approved by the Secretary.

Immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor and on a number of occasions thereafter, groups of enemy aliens considered to be dangerous to hemispheric security were deported to the United States from various of the other American republics for internment here with a view to later repatriation. A large number of these persons have already been repatriated to Germany, Italy, and Japan at their own request or with their consent, most of them during the war in exchange for Americans interned in enemy countries. A considerable number of others, including many who were leaders in anti-American activities, now decline to return to their native countries, wishing to move back to Latin America or to remain here. It is the disposition of the latter cases with which the new Alien Enemy Control Section is concerned.

The desirability of ridding this hemisphere of dangerous Axis nationals was recognized by all the American republics at the Mexico City conference last winter; the Final Act of that conference included a recommendation that measures be taken "to prevent any person whose deportation was deemed necessary for reasons of security of the Continent from further residing in this hemisphere, if such residence would be prejudicial to the future security or welfare of the Americas." Pursuant to that recommendation, on September 8 the President of the United States by proclamation authorized the Secretary of State to order the repatriation of dangerous alien enemies deported to this country during the war.<sup>1</sup>

In proceeding with this program the Department intends to follow an orderly procedure wholly consistent with American concepts of fairness and equity. A preliminary review of the cases is now going on, with a view to releasing as quickly as possible those persons who may safely

be allowed to remain in this hemisphere. Any person who appears to be so clearly dangerous as to make his repatriation desirable will be given ample opportunity for a hearing, and before a repatriation order is issued his case will be reviewed by a high officer of the Department. Finally, the Department does not propose to order repatriation in any case until after consultation with the other American republic concerned.

The over-all objective of this program is to accomplish the purposes of resolution VII of the Mexico City conference, especially "to prevent Axis-inspired elements from securing or regaining vantage points from which to disturb or threaten the security or welfare of any [American] Republic". It is the policy of the Department to pursue that objective in close cooperation with the other American republics.<sup>2</sup>

### Establishment and Functions of the Alien Enemy Control Section<sup>3</sup>

**Purpose.** The purpose of this order is to establish an Alien Enemy Control Section and to transfer certain responsibilities from the Special Projects Division to that Section.

**1 Establishment of the Alien Enemy Control Section.** There is hereby established an Alien Enemy Control Section (routing symbol A-Br/A), which will function under the direction and supervision of the Assistant Secretary for American Republic Affairs.

**2 Functions.** (a) The Alien Enemy Control Section will have responsibility for the initiation of policy and action with respect to all matters concerning the disposition of alien enemies, presently in the United States, who were removed from other American republics during the course of the war. In the discharge of its responsibility, this Section will have the following functions:

(1) The examination of all aspects of the problem in consultation with other interested agencies of the Government and officers of the Department.

(2) The preparation for approval of the Secretary of a statement of the standards to be employed in deciding and disposing of the cases in question.

(3) The making of recommendations to the Assistant Secretary for American Republic Affairs with respect to the establishment of an orderly and fair procedure for arriving at a decision in each case in the light of the standards approved by the Secretary, and for properly disposing of each case in accordance with such decision, the procedure to include: (i) a preliminary administrative review of each case; (ii) the providing of an opportunity for a hearing, before a board to be later constituted, in any case where the finding from such preliminary review is in favor of removal; and (iii) a final

<sup>1</sup> BULLETIN of Sept. 9, 1945, p. 361.

<sup>2</sup> For article, "Elimination of Axis Influence in This Hemisphere: Measures Adopted at the Mexico City Conference", by Thomas C. Mann, see BULLETIN of May 20, 1945, p. 924; see also BULLETIN of July 1, 1945, p. 21, for statement by Assistant Secretary Clayton on security against renewed German aggression.

<sup>3</sup> Departmental Order 1352, dated Oct. 26, 1945, and effective Oct. 24, 1945.

review by an officer of the Department of a rank not less than Assistant Secretary in any case where the finding of the hearing board is in favor of removal.

(4) The assembling of all available evidence and information with respect to the enemy aliens in question.

(5) The conducting of a preliminary administrative review of each case and the carrying out or making of arrangements for such further steps as may be necessary for arriving at a decision on, and the disposing of each case in accordance with the procedure approved by the Assistant Secretary for American Republic Affairs.

(6) The handling of all pertinent correspondence and the answering of all pertinent inquiries on the subject of the enemy aliens in question. (The Division of Coordination and Review will take steps to insure that all outgoing correspondence referring to these persons, of whom a list will be provided, is routed through the Alien Enemy Control Section.)

(7) The consulting with the Department of Justice with respect to any litigation pending or which may arise in connection with the problem.

(8) In addition to the foregoing functions, the performing of all other functions which shall prove necessary to the fulfillment of its responsibility and which shall be approved by the Assistant Secretary for American Republic Affairs.

(b) It shall also be the responsibility of the Alien Enemy Control Section to collaborate with other offices and divisions of the Department in the formulation and execution of a program to implement Resolution No. VII of the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace with respect to enemy aliens in the other American republics. In all cases affecting such enemy aliens, the Special Projects Division shall consult with the Alien Enemy Control Section.

**3 Transfer of functions.** The responsibility of the Special Projects Division in connection with the initiation of policy and action with respect to all matters concerning the disposition of alien enemies, presently in the United States, who were removed from other American republics during the course of the war is hereby transferred to the Alien Enemy Control Section.

**4 Departmental orders amended.** Departmental Order 1301 of December 20, 1944, and any other orders, the provisions of which are in conflict herewith, are accordingly amended.

JAMES F. BYRNES

## Establishment of the Interim Research and Intelligence Service<sup>1</sup>

**Purpose.** This order is issued to establish the Interim Research and Intelligence Service (routing symbol IRIS) as an organizational entity in the Department of State for the period October 1 through December 31, 1945, pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 9621 of September 20, 1945 (10 F.R. 17645).

**1 Establishment and functions of the Service.** There is hereby established the Interim Research and Intelli-

gence Service which shall be responsible for those functions of the Office of Strategic Services transferred to the Department of State by Executive Order 9621, until other disposition is made of these functions.

**2 Head of the Service.** The head of the Interim Research and Intelligence Service shall be the Special Assistant to the Secretary in charge of research and intelligence.

**3 Personnel, records, property and funds.** All personnel, records, property and appropriation balances transferred from the Office of Strategic Services to the Department of State by determination of the Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to Executive Order 9621, shall be placed initially under the Interim Research and Intelligence Service.

**4 Amendment of previous orders.** Any departmental orders, the provisions of which are in conflict herewith, are accordingly amended.

JAMES F. BYRNES

## Establishment and Responsibilities of the Special Assistant to the Secretary in Charge of Research and Intelligence

**Purpose.** This Order establishes the position of Special Assistant to the Secretary in charge of research and intelligence and outlines his responsibilities.

**1 Position.** There is hereby established the position of Special Assistant to the Secretary in charge of research and intelligence, to rank with Assistant Secretaries.

**2 Responsibilities.** The Special Assistant to the Secretary in charge of research and intelligence shall be responsible:

(a) For advice and assistance to the Secretary with respect to the development of a coordinated program for the procuring and production of foreign intelligence needed by the Department of State.

(b) For advice and assistance to the Secretary with respect to the development of a comprehensive and coordinated foreign intelligence program for all Federal agencies concerned with that type of activity.

(c) For the direction of such organization units as are hereafter established in the Department for the procuring and production of foreign intelligence.

(d) For the direction, until December 31, 1945, of the Interim Research and Intelligence Service.

(e) For the performance of those functions of the Director of Strategic Services and of the United States Joint Chiefs of Staff, relating to the functions of the Interim Research and Intelligence Service, as are transferred to the Secretary of State pursuant to Executive Order 9621 of September 20, 1945 (10 F.R. 17645).

<sup>1</sup> Departmental Order 1350, dated Oct. 26, 1945 and effective Oct. 24, 1945.

<sup>2</sup> Departmental Order 1351, dated Oct. 26, 1945 and effective Oct. 24, 1945.



**3 Organization.** The office of the Special Assistant to the Secretary in charge of research and intelligence shall include such deputies, advisers, assistants and appurtenant staff as may be deemed necessary.

**4 Departmental Orders Amended.** Departmental Order 1301 of December 20, 1944 and any other orders, the provisions of which are in conflict herewith, are accordingly amended.

JAMES F. BYRNES

## Divisions of Communications and Records and Central Services<sup>1</sup>

**Purpose.** This order is issued to improve the organization of the Department by segregating the functions relating to communications and records.

**1 Reestablishment of a Division of Communications and Records.** There is hereby reestablished in the Office of Departmental Administration a Division of Communications and Records.

**2 Functions of the Division.** The Division of Communications and Records shall be responsible for the formulation of policies and the development and establishment of procedures and regulations governing the dispatch, receipt, and distribution of all correspondence and telegraphic communications that are transmitted via the diplomatic channels (telegraphic and diplomatic pouch) between the United States and other countries. Specifically it shall:

(a) Formulate the policies, procedures, and regulations governing the general use of such diplomatic channels for the above communications;

(b) Negotiate with other agencies of the United States Government concerning their use of such diplomatic channels;

(c) Establish methods of coordination for the outgoing communications originating in other Government agencies for transmission via these channels, in order to eliminate any conflict in policy as expressed in them and determine the clearances required for such communications;

(d) Determine the routing of all incoming communications within the Department, for action and information, the distribution of copies of outgoing telegrams and airmgrams for information within the Department of State and the paraphrase and distribution of telegrams and airmgrams to other Government agencies;

(e) Operate the telegraph office of the Department of State, including the coding and decoding of security messages for all Government departments;

(f) Formulate regulations for the use of the diplomatic channels of communication by private individuals and organizations, including negotiation with United States censorship and customs officials;

(g) Administer and operate the system for transmit-

ting written communications within the Department of State and between the Department and the foreign missions and Government agencies in Washington, including the messenger system of the Department, and operate the domestic mail handling system for the Department;

(h) Have general jurisdiction over the filing system and record-retirement program for Departmental correspondence and the operation of the central Departmental files and records;

(i) Have responsibility for developing research into files and records in connection with requests from the Department and other agencies for technical data and information;

(j) Collaborate with the Division of Foreign Reporting Services as regards those functions transferred to its jurisdiction from DC/L to maintain the accurate distribution and dispatching of that type of reporting services for which FR is held responsible.

**3 To maintain supervision of DC/L functions.** The liaison functions of the Commercial Liaison Section (DC/L) shall be the responsibility of the Division of Communications and Records except for those specific operations which are assigned to FR.

**4 Functions of the Division of Central Services.** Functions of the Division of Central Services, other than those described in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this order, will continue to be the responsibility of the Division of Central Services.

**5 Effective date.** The transfer of the existing communications and records functions shall be made as of November 1, 1945. The transfer of the functions of the Diplomatic Mail and Pouch Section and any related mail activities and of messenger functions shall be effective at dates to be specified by the Director of the Office of Departmental Administration.

**6 Transfer of personnel and records.** The personnel at present performing any of the functions hereby assigned to the Division of Communications and Records, together with the records and equipment pertaining thereto, are hereby transferred to that division.

**7 Routing symbols.** The routing symbol for the Division of Communications and Records shall be DC; the routing symbol for the Division of Central Services shall be changed to CS. The corresponding symbols for the several subordinate units of the two divisions shall be changed accordingly.

**8 Departmental order amended.** Departmental Order 1301 of December 20, 1944 (section XVII, paragraph 4) is hereby amended.

JAMES F. BYRNES

## Appointment of Officers

Lt. Richard F. Cook as Executive Officer in the Office of Transport and Communications Policy, effective October 25, 1945.

Walter K. Scott as Chief of the Division of Communications and Records, effective October 30, 1945.

<sup>1</sup> Departmental order 1354, dated Oct. 29, 1945 and effective Nov. 1, 1945.



## THE CONGRESS

Additional Appropriation, Fiscal Year 1946, for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. H.Rept. 1166, 79th Cong., to accompany H.J.Res. 266. 7 pp. [Favorable report.]

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, 1946: Hearings before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on a House joint resolution making appropriations for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for the fiscal year 1946. ii, 273 pp.

Supplemental Estimates of Appropriation and Drafts of Proposed Provisions for the Department of State. Communication from the President of the United States transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 in the amount of \$9,060,059.36, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations, for the Department of State. H.Doc. 367, 79th Cong. 3 pp.

Study of Immigration and Naturalization Laws and Problems: Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, pursuant to H.Res. 52, authorizing a study of immigration and naturalization laws and problems. Part 1, April 24 and May 2, 1945, iii, 42 pp.; Part 2, July 3, 1945, iii, 24 pp.

To Grant a Quota to Eastern Hemisphere Indians and To Make Them Racially Eligible for Naturalization: Hearings before the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on H.R. 173, H.R. 1584, H.R. 1624, H.R. 1746, H.R. 2256, H.R. 2609, bills to grant a quota to Eastern Hemisphere Indians and to make them racially eligible for naturalization. Part 2, July 3, 1945. ii, 2 pp.

Return of Vested Property to Persons Not Hostile to the United States: Hearing before Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, on H.R. 3750, a bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, September 12, 1945, Serial No. 7. iii, 60 pp.

## THE FOREIGN SERVICE

### Consular Offices

The American Consulate General at Batavia, Java, was established on October 24, 1945.

## Publications

### of the DEPARTMENT OF STATE

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C., who is the authorized distributor of Government publications. To avoid delay, address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

\**The Proclaimed List of Certain Blocked Nationals*, Cumulative Supplement No. 7, October 25, 1945, containing additions, amendments, and deletions made since Revision IX of February 28, 1945. Publication 2401. 118 pp. Free.

Promulgated under presidential proclamation of July 17, 1941, as authorized under the Trading with the Enemy Act, being a list of persons deemed to be or to have been acting in collaboration with the enemy, and also of persons to whom the export of materials from the United States is deemed to be detrimental to the interest of national defense.

*A cumulative list of the publications of the Department of State, from October 1, 1929 to July 1, 1945 (publication 2373) may be secured from the Department of State.*

## *Contents*—Continued

<b>TREATY INFORMATION</b>	<b>Page</b>
The St. Lawrence Waterway and World Trade. By Edward G. Miller, Jr. . . . .	715
Ratification of the Charter of the United Nations: Greece, India, Peru . . . . .	723
Transmittal of U. S.—U. K. Petroleum Agreement to the Senate. Message of the President . . . . .	737
<b>THE DEPARTMENT</b>	
Oath of Office Taken by Spruille Braden . . . . .	714
Alien Enemy Control Section . . . . .	737
Establishment and Functions of the Alien Enemy Control Section . . . . .	738
Establishment of the Interim Research and Intelligence Service . . . . .	739
Establishment and Responsibilities of the Special Assistant to the Secretary in Charge of Research and Intelligence . . . . .	739
Divisions of Communications and Records and Central Services . . . . .	740
Appointment of Officers . . . . .	740
<b>THE FOREIGN SERVICE</b>	
Consular Offices . . . . .	741
<b>PUBLICATIONS</b>	
Department of State . . . . .	741
<b>THE CONGRESS</b>	741